TO
OLIN T. BINKLEY

Acknowledgments

As the dedication page indicates, this book honors Olin T. Binkley. I am indebted to him for having taught me New Testament during my junior year at Wake Forest College. He opened the meaning and message of the New Testament to me in such a way that Jesus Christ became for me a living Reality. *Christ and Selfhood*, in large measure, is a "carrying forth" of what Professor Binkley initiated there.

The Faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary have provided the creative atmosphere of productive discussion of many of the issues in this book. I am indebted to them for their comradeship in the faith represented here, and especially for the confidence they expressed in recommending me to the American Association of Theological Schools for a Fellowship grant to subsidize a sabbatical leave in 1960-1961 during which time these pages have been written. I am grateful to the American Association of Theological Schools for making the grant, and I herewith submit this manuscript for publication as fulfillment of my covenant with them upon accepting the Fellowship.

The Faculty of the Union Theological Seminary in New York are also my benefactors in this project. I have had the

grateful to my colleague Professor Dale Moody for similar assistance. However, I accept full responsibility for the contents of *Christ and Selfhood* and would not want them to feel burdened by my residual ignorance after they did their best with me.

This book has been written in a New York apartment; and my wife and two sons, Bill and Charles, are due a great measure of gratitude for their patience, considerateness, and understanding. A special debt of gratitude is due also to Mrs. Earl Goodman who carefully prepared the finished manuscript in typed form.

<div align="right">Wayne E. Oates</div>

Contents

Invitation to Dialogue

The Christian pastor and theologian who takes seriously the findings of contemporary psychologists and other philosophers of personality faces a dilemma as he begins a discussion of Christology and selfhood. He can hold in abeyance his presuppositions as to the centrality of Christ in any distinctively Christian understanding of selfhood. He then takes the position of an auditor, a listener, as it were, in the circle of psychological theorists. The results of his consultations with psychologists, psychiatrists, and philosophers of personality may greatly enrich his work as a theologian. He can examine, criticize, and clarify his own understanding of selfhood in Christ through the use of the data he has gathered from listening sympathetically to behavioral scientists and philosophers. But he may be in the position of attributing weight to their ideas which they themselves would not be. They in turn have received nothing from him. He has merely used their findings without contributing to them.

On the other side of the dilemma, the theologian can state unequivocally his conviction concerning the importance of the person of Christ for the selfhood of man. Then

he enters into the arena of contemporary psychology, psychiatry, and philosophy of personality as a polemicist. He does the talking and takes willingly the position of defense. He is ready to be challenged by the behavioral scientists. He may for all practical purposes be convinced of the great worth of contemporary models of personality for interpreting as well as understanding the person and work of Christ. But he may be heard by behavioral scientists as "being against them." He may clearly leave the impression that he is doing battle against heretics. All the while he may be a hero in his own eyes, thinking of himself now as a Tertullian, then as an Augustine, and later as a Schleiermacher or Bultmann. This may feed his fantasies, but it does little to "convince," much less "convert" his scientific audience. Such an audience, if he ever had them as an audience, would have long ago left him. Only those who previously agreed with him anyhow would be left for an audience.

In both instances which have been described, two things have happened. First, the conversation has been one-sided. The monologue that ensues grows out of two different sorts of imperialism. The tacit assumption has been that the speaker in both instances "has the answer" and the hearer has nothing to contribute. Overstreet has called this imperialism an "over-under relationship." The purpose of genuine learning and growth are defeated in both the speaker and the listener by such a relationship. This imperialism should be avoided with great self-discipline for the plain reason that it destroys communication. Second, both the approaches we have discussed increase the degree of isolation in both the theologian and the behavioral scientists, a part of the very dilemma we are seeking to resolve. Therefore, the theologian who writes on

the subject of Christology and selfhood must find a creative alternative to the dilemma we have described.

The creative alternative to monologue is dialogue. Here the theologian takes the initiative and explicitly states his working hypothesis of selfhood in Christ. He states his presuppositions with a developed awareness of how philosophers of personality, psychologists, and psychiatrists have already exercised shaping influence upon his formulation of these hypotheses. As he develops his exposition further, he points out how in previous generations of theologians psychological modes of interpretation have shaped Christology. Yet he recognizes his own major debt as being to Christ himself for the kind of selfhood he has received as a gift through the decisive act of God in Christ. Furthermore, he also recognizes that many of the answers devised by psychologists have been too prompted by serious questions on the kind of person possible in Christ or at least in a Christian culture.

The Christian pastor and theologian therefore states his working hypotheses of Christian selfhood and invites both behavorial scientists and other theologians to reason together with him in a meaningful dialogue. In a real way, every Christian pastor should be seen as a theologian. Pastors have too long been characterized by patterns of preoccupied irresponsibility in our tasks both as theologians and as spiritual conversationalists with behavioral scientists. The invitation to dialogue then calls for the discipline as well as the understanding of the self. To be dialogue, a conversation must be free of intellectual tyranny, special pleading, and various kinds of academic "gamesmanship," and "one-upmanship," as Charles Stinnette calls it. Each participant must be committed to mutual rever-

ence for and edification of the other. Through the accept-
ance of these disciplines as laws of life, let me as the author
of this conversation with my reader initiate what I hope
will be genuine dialogue, whatever his station in life may
be.

The conversation initiated here rests upon the results of
my work in a previous volume, *Religious Dimensions of
Personality* (1957). The objective is to set forth clearly the
truth arrived at in the last chapter of the book: "The claim
to uniqueness of the Christian understanding of person-
ality resides wholly in the Person of Jesus Christ." This
book is an invitation to dialogue which moves from this
conviction into the development, clarification, and demon-
stration of what we mean when we say this.

CHRIST AND SELFHOOD

The Decisive Factor in Selfhood:
Encounter with Christ

> For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, whom we preached
> among you . . . was not Yes and No; but in him it is al-
> ways Yes. For all the promises of God find their Yes in him
> (II Corinthians 1:19-20).*
>
> For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for
> good works, which God prepared beforehand that we
> should walk in them (Ephesians 2:10).

When we define selfhood more generally we mean the
habitual center of focus of man's identity. The Christian
understanding of selfhood is more explicit than this. The
Christian assumes that the decisive factor in focusing man's
identity is his encounter with Christ. By "focus" we intend
deliberately to use metaphorically the exact meanings of
the word. The life of man, after being refracted or reflected
away from his origins in his Creator's mind, is focused in
Christ through faith. The diverging rays of man's inten-
tions are decisively turned about and converged in a vir-
tual focus of selfhood in Christ. The eternal circle of God's

---

* Unless otherwise indicated, all biblical excerpts are quoted from the
Revised Standard Version.

truth meets the finite line of man's existence in the decisive
point in history of the Incarnation of Jesus Christ. In Jesus
the selfhood of God is focused. This in turn becomes the
very parabola in which the selfhood of man may be truly
actualized, to use a geometric definition of focus. But more
intimately personal than this is the metaphor of the exact
Latin meaning of focus, namely "hearth" or "home." In
Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit God has come to the self
and made his home in the self. The self is no longer a
wandering, searching identity but has found its true dwell-
ing place in Christ. Jesus Christ is the historical Event and
transforming Person from whom all distinctively Christian
notions of selfhood are derived. For the Christian, Jesus
Christ is the norm of appraisal of all other forms of psy-
chological wisdom. Discussions of the psychology of self-
hood omit the major Christian distinction when the
decisive factor of man's personal encounter with Jesus
Christ is not considered. The intention here is to demon-
strate and explain this forthrightly stated hypothesis.

The pilgrimage of encounter with Christ on the part of
the Christian community is in itself an historical treasure
of psychological wisdom. The ways in which fluctuating
psychological modes of life both have been shaped by and
have exerted shaping influence upon the interpretation of
the Person of Jesus Christ throw vivid light upon our
knowledge of ourselves. These influences, when properly
assessed, are particularly helpful in clarifying the selfhood
of the Christian pastor. More recently, Christology and the
psychology of selfhood, contrary to prescientific psychol-
ogy, have been considered in isolation from each other.
Their interaction with each other needs fresh exploration.
Ancient psychologies are still relevant for our understand-

ing of selfhood, but they are not the prevalent mode of address in our culture. Contemporary psychologies have something to offer to our day in the clarification of our recital and proclamation of redemption in Jesus Christ. These psychologies *are* prevalent modes of address in our culture. These are some of the themes and emphases of this discussion. But the moving presupposition of the whole discussion from the outset to the conclusion is that man's encounter with God in Christ is the focusing Power and Light in his becoming and remaining a continuing self. The method will be to move from the primary datum of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ to some of the psychological issues of selfhood rather than vice versa. True self-knowledge, as Calvin has said, comes from a "previous contemplation" of the "face of God." We have seen this in Jesus Christ.

This chapter, therefore, will be devoted to a further clarification of what we mean when we say that encounter with Christ is the decisive factor in man's being and becoming a self. In order to do this, several things will be discussed: First, we shall need to give attention to what we mean by selfhood in this perspective. Second, we shall pay attention to meaning of encounter with Christ. Third, the decisiveness of this encounter in the birth of the new self in Christ will focus the identity of man in a distinctively Christian selfhood.

The Meaning of Selfhood

A diffuse, undefined sense of personal identity begins very early in life. A second-grade child stands on the playground watching his friends jump rope. *Suddenly he notices that he can watch himself watch them.* Now he has

a new-found ability "to think about his own thinking." Then he learns that this ability is always with him. Even when he tries to quit thinking, he is thinking about trying to quit thinking! Then, like Alice in Wonderland, he discovers he has "a world of his own." He has his life on his hands and must do something with it. He has discovered the possibility of being a person in his own right, but is left with the decision as to the kind of person he is going to be. He has, in an adult's words, discovered a subjective identity and felt the weight of this identity. Yet he has had neither the time nor the opportunity to focus this identity. What will be decisive in this focusing? He has the primitive rudiments of selfhood. What actualizes these possibilities?

Sören Kierkegaard said that "every man is primitively planned to be a self." † [1] Yet every man always struggles— within his vague, diffuse, and undefined sense of identity— to focus, define, and give specific meaning to his "quest for identity." As Ortega y Gassett has said, "Life is essentially a desperate struggle to succeed in being in fact that which we are in design." [2] The Christian faith both recognizes this struggle for its crucial stringency and confronts man with a qualitative meaning of selfhood that makes the difference between the "old self" and the "new self," between life and death.

The Christian gospel, as the biblical record of the revelation of God in Christ presents it, nowhere implies that the person who is not a Christian is not a self at all. To the contrary, the New Testament draws a dramatic and clear picture of the selfhood of the person who is not a Christian. The writers do this by bearing witness to the kind of life

---

† All numbered references will be found as notes at the end of each chapter.

they experienced prior to their own decisive encounter with Christ. They contrast the "old self" with the "new self" in Christ. They said: "We know that our old self was crucified with Christ . . ." (Romans 6:6). A new self had been raised to walk in the newness of life. This contrast is crucial and pervades the very atmosphere of the New Testament.

What were the characteristics of the "old self" as contrasted with the "new self" in Christ? The old self was *separated* from Christ, whereas nothing could separate the new self from him. The old self was *alienated* and isolated from the community of faith, whereas the new self was reconciled with God and the people of God. The old self was a *stranger*, but the new self was now a fellow citizen in the household of God. (See Ephesians 2:12-21.) The old self was drained of hope, but the new self has hope "poured" into his heart "through the Holy Spirit . . ." (Romans 5:5). The old self was "enslaved to the elemental spirits" or "no-gods" of the universe. The new self in Christ was "no longer a slave but a son." The old self has been redeemed and adopted into the family of God as a son and an heir, not as a slave. For this freedom did the Christ set us free (Galatians 4:1-11). Finally, the old self lacked identity with a "people"; the Christians were, before encounter with Christ, "not a people." Now they were "God's people." The decisive factor that made the difference between the old self and the new self was their encounter with Christ (I Peter 2:10).

This encounter made the difference, not only between the old self and the new self: it made the difference between life and death. The transforming encounter with Christ was according to the "law of the Spirit of life" and had set them "free from the law of sin and death" (Romans

8:2). The old self was a servant of sin and was paid in the wages of sin: death. The new self was a son in the house of a loving parent and received the free gift of life through Christ (Romans 6:23). Life was permeated with light, the light of the knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ. Death was the epitome of darkness out of which Christ had called them "as alive from the dead" to show forth his marvelous light (I Peter 2:9). Christ himself is the "true light that enlightens every man" that comes into the world, says John 1:9, thereby affirming the identity of every man. But this identity is focused in a faith-encounter with Christ, for "to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave the power to become children of God."

Gregory Zilboorg, in commenting upon psychoanalytic appraisals of selfhood, very early perceived that these were descriptions of the old man, or, as he put it, man in sin. These therapists comment upon the self in its separation, estrangement, alienation, bondage, and despair. Their truths can be entered by the Christian theologian into his understanding of the lonely pilgrimage of people from diffuse identity to defined selfhood. The Christian pastor can use these truths as guides to a more precise understanding of a more realistic participation with people struggling to "put off the old man" and to "put on Christ" in whom the Christian's life is hid in God. On the other hand, the Christian both as theologian and as pastor has a contribution to make to psychologist, psychiatrist, and psychoanalyst in the assessment of the *nature* of the encounter whereby man is fundamentally changed and as to the *quality* of the selfhood into which he is being changed. The Christian theologian and pastor bears witness to the decisive focus of identity in Christ. Both the nature of the transforming en-

counter and the quality of selfhood are epitomized in the person of Jesus Christ.[3]

The Nature of Encounter with Christ

Both from a theological and a pastoral point of view, the nature of the encounter of a person with Christ must be explored. The first thing that needs to be said is that *this encounter initiates in God and not in man.* By his own decision, God has in Christ chosen to come out on the road of life and meet man where he is. Arnold Toynbee challenges the idolization of religious institutions in his historical approach to religion. He criticizes the grandiosity of those Christians who assume that God has spoken for all time and eternity in Jesus Christ. But Daniel Day Williams challenges this accusation of megalomania with the comment that the basic issue of God's Incarnation in Christ is not the grandiose feelings of this or that group of vested interests in modern Christendom but of a decisive act of God in history. If we ask who the man of God's own choosing is, says Luther, the answer is: "Christ Jesus, it is he!" This is not, as Toynbee's reference infers, a choice or decision of man or a group of men, but of God himself. We cannot let the emphasis rest upon ourselves as chosen people but upon God as a choosing God who has decisively acted in Jesus Christ.[4]

Furthermore, this decision of God to reveal himself in Jesus Christ confronts man uniquely in its ultimate wholeheartedness. In previous and subsequent revelations of himself, God revealed himself in what Andras Angyal calls "part-processes." To prophets and poets God, as Phillips translates the prologue of the Book of Hebrews, "gave many different glimpses of the truth." But "this Son, Radi-

ance of the glory of God, flawless Expression of the nature of God, Himself the Upholding Principle of all that is, effected in person the reconciliation between God and Man . . ." (Hebrews 1:3, Phillips Translation). Jesus Christ may be perceived in part by his interpreters who always prophesy in part, but he himself was no demigod. In him, God decisively and wholeheartedly confronts man.

In the second place, whereas the encounter of man by God in Christ initiates in God, the encounter is one of personal Love. The attitude of God toward the old man—separated, alienated, estranged, wandering and sinful—was not one of rejection and hostility. These portray the stance of the old man toward God, but not God's perspective of man. God is not impersonal law, nor spiritual apathy at work. God is Love. He has decided to communicate himself as such in Christ. In C. G. Jung's interpretation of Job, Job seeks to actualize himself by demanding an answer of God as to the nature of His being. Is God a loving and living God, capable of response to man's plight with salvation? The "answer to Job" is Christ. In him the answer is an "everlasting yes."

God's communication of himself as personal Love epitomizes the very nature of his confrontation of man. He confronts man as a Self in Christ, challenging man to become a self in Christ. God has chosen to communicate himself as Self-Giving even though he had already been perceived by man as Self-Demanding. The self-demand of God resulted in Law which could be fulfilled only in the self-giving of grace. That which he demanded of man in the Law, God in Christ now enabled man to have as a gift through grace: self-acceptance.

Furthermore, God in Christ chose to declare himself

openly to man, whereas man was and still is ever-ready to say, for his own self-avoidance purposes, that God cannot be known. The hidden God became the manifest God in Christ. The Word was made flesh. Man beheld him full of grace and truth. God actualized himself in Jesus Christ. His own identity was focused in Christ, his own selfhood made manifest. No longer could men say without self-avoidance: "I cannot know God." "For it is the God who said, 'Let light shine out of darkness,' who has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ" (II Corinthians 4:6).

The third aspect of the nature of the encounter with Christ is crucial for both Christology and selfhood. Even though God the Father chose to actualize his own selfhood by becoming fully man in the Son, Jesus Christ in turn chose fully to actualize his true selfhood by revealing in the flesh what he already had been from the foundations of the world: God. The temptations in the wilderness reveal this process of decision. They would be more accurately called the decisions in the wilderness. He chose to affirm his humanity in hunger and thirst. He accepted the limitation of his power to those powers of a servant of man rather than a slave driver of men. He became obedient unto the same laws—even the law of death—to which all other men were obedient. He actualized his divinity by becoming the new Adam, subject to temptation, yet without succumbing to it. Jesus chose to encounter, not only other men as sinners, but also himself as man. Thereby he actualized his own selfhood as the "only begotten of the Father." Never before or since lived or spoke such a man as this. Jesus' own decisions cannot be seen as casual adjuncts to the encounter of God with man. He was no puppet or demigod

somehow or other swung down from God. He was a decid-
ing Person whose identity as God was focused upon his
true manhood in a decisive struggle of selfhood.

Jesus, in addition to the stresses of the decisions in the
wilderness, confronted his own humanity in the decisive
issues of his day-to-day living. These issues were at least
threefold in scope and depth, faced by Jesus as all men have
faced them. He had to come to grips with *his own heritage*
as a member of the Jewish community. He very early de-
veloped a vivid sense of history. By the time he preached
his inaugural sermon at Nazareth, he had already chosen
to affirm the prophetic heritage of Isaiah and to diminish
the scribal tradition. The Scripture from Isaiah, not Ezra,
was fulfilled in the ears of his hearers. This was symbolic
of the decisions he had made about his identity. These
focused his identity in a prophetic selfhood. *Again, he
chose his true vocation: he was "anointed" to participate
fully in the sufferings of those about him* rather than to
detach himself from them. His powers were focused not
upon his own identity but upon the removal of hindrances
to new life in those about him. Jesus thus actualized his
own selfhood as Sufferer. He clarified his intentions to
men and interpreted the good news of the kingdom of God
as he performed his works of healing with his fellow hu-
man beings. Serious questions have been raised by many
textual critics as to the authenticity of the sayings of Jesus
about his purpose and calling. Even more serious questions
are raised by form critics. Nevertheless, positive awareness
of a clear-cut sense of vocation is evident in the serenity
and courageous peace with which he made every move.
This becomes increasingly evident as he moves toward
Jerusalem the last time. The "set" of his intention to go to

Jerusalem even at the protest of his disciples reflects a clearly outlined selfhood. Jesus knew from whence he came, who he was, and where he was going.

Finally, Jesus' selfhood was overarched by an eschatological sense of destiny and undergirded by an unfaltering trust in the power of the Father to transcend death. He knew God as the God of the living and not the dead. As someone said, Jesus in his earthly ministry attended resurrections, not funerals. Out of this participation in the Eternal, Jesus' sense of Messiahship as the Suffering Servant was the habitual center of his identity, the focused awareness of his selfhood. A. J. Rawlinson says that our "Lord from the time of his Baptism onwards was inwardly sure that he was Messiah, and therefore clothed with supreme authority from God." [5] Yet this was Messiahship from a totally different perspective from that of even his closest disciples. The transforming fulfillment of the Resurrection, however, made the true selfhood completely transparent to followers of his who only then did in truth and fact decisively encounter Christ. Only in encounter with the Risen Lord was their selfhood brought to full-term birth. Whether or not Jesus was aware of his Messiahship has been questioned by John Knox and others. They consider the radical transformation wrought by the Risen Lord to have been so great that the disciples and writers reinterpreted everything Jesus had said to them from the vantage point of their new selfhood. But the question needs to be raised as to the psychological difference between Jesus' sense of personal identity as the Son of God and his focused selfhood as the Messiah. Furthermore, would he also have been out of touch with his real selfhood if, all the while being the Messiah, he himself did not have some clear focus

of this real selfhood in his own thinking as he decisively encountered his own humanity? Regardless of how we answer these questions in later chapters, the fact remains that the Christ who confronts man today is the Resurrected Christ, the Lord of life. The birth of selfhood ensues from this decisive encounter with a Living God.

Encounter with Christ and the Birth of a New Self

We have moved on the hypothesis that encounter with Christ is the decisive factor in the transformation of a diffuse, alienated identity into a clearly focused and true selfhood. Every man's "primitively planned" selfhood is, as we have seen, a wandering, disrupted, isolated, and sin-laden identity. Men sit in darkness and await a great light. They live under the poignant despair that they may reach old age before there appears a "dayspring from on high" whereby they may discern some durably meaningful sense in the nonsense of their personal histories. They indecisively let the sands of time run through their fingers as they toy with the many alternatives of the kind of person they would like to become. In almost a spirit of make-believe, they try on these alternatives for size as if they were a thing apart from themselves. But the processes of judgment are at work nevertheless, for, as Albert Camus has said, "a man defines himself by his make-believe as well as his sincere impulses." [6] Men anxiously clutch at this or that secondhand report of how someone else achieved peace, courage, a sense of direction, and a clear understanding of his purpose in life. But somehow or other it never happens to them. As Robert Frost said of the hired man, they have nothing to look back upon with pride nor to look forward to with hope.

But the question emerges: Of what does this encounter with Christ consist and how in fact does it actually take place? The encounter consists of a meeting and a decision, a confrontation and a response.

The Meeting and Confrontation. The contemporary man's psychological knowledge is a two-edged sword. At the same time it enables him to understand himself better, he is also empowered by his new knowledge *to avoid* understanding himself better. Yet, these instruments of wisdom are not the only ones whereby a man avoids meeting himself, to say nothing of the way his distance machinery works overtime in evading meeting Christ. Contemporary sophistication, David C. McClelland has said, causes men and women to be unwilling and hesitant to speak of their religious convictions.[7] But some candid meeting of Jesus Christ in history and contemporary existence is the first requirement of any genuine encounter of identity with him or antagonism against him, and we must not be vague as to how this meeting can and does take place.

The first thing that any research man does when he purports to arrive at a dependable set of conclusions is to consult the primary sources about the person with whom he wishes to become acquainted. A personal encounter with Jesus Christ is no exception to this. The biblical record provides the fullest and most dependable account of him as a person, as well as the kind of influence he exerted in the selfhood of those who knew him firsthand. The authors of these records at no point claim for themselves infallibility. At every point they seek humbly to bear witness to the Son of God who loved them, gave himself for them, and brought to them new life in the Resurrection. Nor do these records aim at any petty consistency in peripheral details.

Rather, their authors speak with gladness and singleness of heart of the transforming fellowship he had created between them in the gift of the Holy Spirit. Without effort they speak with an inspired harmony rather than a monotonous unison as to their redemption by him. The person today who would meet the Lord Jesus Christ can initiate the acquaintance by reading these primary documents.

However, the present-day intellectual often speaks *ex cathedra* about the Christian faith without having read its primary documents. He may have sought to understand the sacred writings of other cultures without having mastered the ones indigenous to his own culture. This is tantamount to trying to learn Sanskrit without ever having reduced one's mother's tongue to writing, much less to have become intimately informed of its literary treasures. The illiteracy of many intellectuals in the primary documents of the Christian faith represents a cultural as well as a spiritual cleft within their beings. But more than that it aids and abets their studied avoidance of a face-to-face encounter with Jesus Christ. But a research man's resolve to "come and see" for himself what these records say of Jesus Christ is the first step in meeting him.

Furthermore, the Bible is a record of other men's experience in encounter with Jesus Christ, told in a remarkably unvarnished way. If these were unauthentic accounts the shilly-shallying of the Apostle Peter, the hot temper of the Apostle Paul, and the destructive impulses of James and John would have been smoothed over. But these men's efforts to focus their identity were transformed by their repeated meetings with Jesus Christ. The person today who wishes, therefore, to meet Jesus Christ can do so by

consensually validating his own perceptions of Christ with those of others who have known him, especially the people of the Bible. More than this, people of today who have had experience with Christ can introduce him to the person who really wants to meet him. If a person has "from his youth up" heard of Christ, he can often come more nearly to meeting him more personally by conferring with people who are Christians but who have come from a distinctly unchristian or antichristian background. Also, the traditional Christian deepens his knowledge of Christ every time he humbly seeks to learn about what Christ means to people of other Christian traditions than his own. He is more deeply instructed than this as he communes with people of other races and distant cultures who are Christian. He sheds his provincial distortions of the Christ and sees him more nearly as he is. These are just a few important ways of meeting Christ through empirical efforts of our own.

But the transforming dimension of the encounter with Christ rests in the initiative he himself takes toward us. This is the heart of the revelation of God in Christ: he takes initiative toward us. Communication in prayer has been established through the Holy Spirit, and Christians throughout history have met Christ by sincerely trying to initiate a conversation with him in prayer. Others in the fellowship and communion of the church can create the frame of prayer about one. But the self, as Kierkegaard has said, really becomes the self when it exists alone before God. Karl Heim describes prayer as the initiation of an "entirely new and unique I-Thou relationship." He says that it is different from the detached "onlooking" relation-

ship of scientific observation, the "immersion of myself in myself" of much mysticism, or the extension of human-to-human conversation indigenous to polytheism. "Prayer," says Heim, "stills the incessant movement of my quest for a Thou to whom I can devote myself wholly. God is the omnipresent Thou of every I. . . ." [8] The excruciating theological necessity in men's lives today is not assent to the proposition of the existence of God but firsthand experience in communicating with him. In this God has himself opened the conversation in Jesus Christ.

This conversation forms a totally new center for man's identity. Christ meets man at the center and not the periphery of his being, that is, in direct address to man as a *deciding being*. Jesus Christ confronts man in such a way as to necessitate decisions and responses. These decisions and responses become the focus and design of man's selfhood. The central purpose of this book is to explore in detail the nature of the meeting of man by God in Christ and the ways in which the revelation of God in Christ is determinative of man's selfhood. The Incarnation encounters man in his confession of his history of sin. The Incarnate Christ reveals the one God as love and requires of man a singleheartedness in the love of God and neighbor which, as Calvin says, thereby enables man to know and love himself without self-satisfaction, flattery, and self-worship.[9] The Christ as Messiah participates in the struggle of the self in man's sense of ultimate commitment in vocation. The Risen Christ, triumphant over death, confronts man as a self with a destiny both within and beyond time in the radiant pilgrimage of eternal life. The Christ's promise and gift of the Holy Spirit addresses the selfhood

of man in his continuing growth and transformation in time. The Christ as participant in the Trinity encounters man decisively in his internally diverse and bipolar existence as a self under God.

These dimensions of the encounter with Christ which are so decisive in selfhood will be explored in detail in the following pages. However, the meeting of Christ precipitates a response and decision on the part of man which clearly focuses his selfhood. This needs some preliminary clarification here, pending a more complete later discussion.

Decision and Response. The decisions and responses of man to Christ involve at least three conflicts within the identity of man. These three conflicts must be consciously resolved in the decisions and responses of man to Christ before any clearly defined selfhood comes into being. These three conflicts are fraught, as Paul Tillich says, with the threat of condemnation, meaninglessness, and death. They are these: man's conflict over his personal and cultural background, that is, who he really is; man's conflict over his sense of ultimate concern in calling and vocation, that is, who he is going to be and what he is going to do with his life; and man's conflict over the temporal and the eternal dimensions of his destiny as a child of both the finite and the infinite, namely, the inseparability of his faithful trust and communion in Christ.

The encounter with Christ is decisive in both intensifying and creatively resolving these three conflicts into a coherent and meaningful focus of man's identity. This focus is rightly defined as Christian selfhood for which the Person and Work of Jesus Christ is indispensable. The fol-

lowing chapters will develop these three themes of man's selfhood. They will be correlated with the way in which Christ dealt with these conflicts in his own pilgrimage of selfhood. His victory will be related to the ways in which he redeems and enables us to deal with the same conflicts as we become responsible selves under God.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER ONE

1. Sören Kierkegaard, *The Sickness unto Death* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1941), p. 50.
2. "In Search of Goethe from Within," *Partisan Review*, Vol. 16, No. 12, Dec., 1949, p. 1167.
3. The reader who has not already done so is encouraged to consult the several competent reviews of contemporary discussions of selfhood. Clark E. Moustakas and Sita Eam Jayaswal have edited a symposium, *The Self: Explorations in Personal Growth* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956). G. S. Klein and D. Krech have an equally valuable book entitled *Theoretical Models and Personality* (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1952). The two most influential books on the author's thinking have been Harry Stack Sullivan's *Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry* (Washington, D. C.: William Alanson White Psychiatry Foundation, 1947); and Andras Angyal, *Foundations for a Science of Personality* (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1947). No attempt to review the various theories of selfhood has been made here because excellent works are in abundance which do this in a detailed and technically thorough way. The reader is encouraged, however, to consult such works.
4. Arnold Toynbee, *An Historian's Approach to Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 135.
5. A. J. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., Inc., 1926 and 1949), p. 30.
6. Albert Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1955), p. 13.
7. David C. McClelland, "Religious Overtones in Psychoanalysis," *The Ministry and Mental Health*, Hans Hofmann (New York: Association Press, 1960), p. 49.

8. *Christian Faith and Natural Science* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953), pp. 212-213.
9. John Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion,* tr. by John Allen (Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1936), Book I, Chap. I, Sec. 2.

The Incarnation and Our History of Sin

> For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sake he became poor, so that by his poverty you might become rich (II Corinthians 8:9).

> And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; we have beheld his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father (John 1:14).

> "Come, see a man who told me all that I ever did. Can this be the Christ?" (John 4:29).

In the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, God took seriously both his own responsibility for his creation and man's sinful irresponsibility as the creature made in God's image. Therefore, Jesus Christ, Pittenger writes, "is the focal self-expression and action of God in human life; he is the incarnation of the Word or *Logos* of God." [1] God chose to focus his very identity in the "full integrity of the manhood of Jesus Christ" and thereby to meet man in his history of creatureliness, self-elevation, alienation, and sinfulness. The first benefit of this meeting is the reconciliation of both the divinity and the humanity in Christ himself. As we, in turn, are met by him and enabled thereby to face God in him,

we have to come to terms with our own personal histories of sin. We are thereby prompted to ask who Christ himself is. As the Woman at the Well said: "Come, see a man who told me all that I ever did. Can this be the Christ?"

We have said that before any clearly focused selfhood comes from man's quest for identity he must face up to his conflict over his personal and cultural background. Generally speaking, both the Lord Jesus Christ in the Incarnation and every man in his own human existence face this conflict. The fact that Jesus did so was a part of his true humanity. But, more specifically, man is estranged by sin from God the source of power whereby he may safely face "all that he ever did." Jesus Christ, for having overcome the power of sin, redeems us from the tyranny of our past to determine our destiny. The conditioning reality of the past is always with us. By the grace of God we are what we are. But the meaning of our past can be changed, and, as Paul Tillich says, "the name of this change is the experience of 'forgiveness.' " The "curse-character" of the past has been changed into a "blessing by the transforming power of forgiveness." [2] This happens decisively in the reconciliation that takes place in the Incarnate Christ. God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself. Forgiveness changes conflict and estrangement into peace and fellowship. The good news of the Incarnation is that in Jesus Christ forgiveness is not only possible but in fact and history has actually already taken place. What is left for us to do is to act upon this forgiveness by decisively accepting Christ's love as the organizing center of our identity, as the heart of our existence as a self.

Therefore, we need now to consider the two kinds of action going on in the reconciliation which takes place in

Christ. First, we need to look at some of the ways in which Jesus himself confronted and decisively accepted his own humanity. Thereby he affirmed and concentrated the identity which he had in God from the foundations of the world as the selfhood he would in fact be in the Incarnation. Second, we need to consider the way in which he enables us through his forgiving power to face our own personal conflictual history of sin and alienation and to become the self in fact he has ordained that we should be in creation. In a word, the "good confession" in which we can stand as a self "in the presence of many witnesses," as I Timothy 6:12 says, is rooted and grounded in the "good confession" which Jesus Christ witnessed before Pontius Pilate and in all the days of his flesh (I Timothy 6:13). When we bring our history as sinners into conversation with Jesus Christ, the reconciliation which takes place through his forgiving Love has been made possible by the kind of faith decisions he made in the Incarnation. These faith decisions were not incidental or accidental to his Incarnation. They were the heart of his selfhood.

Jesus' Encounter of His History

Jesus met his own humanity decisively and reconciled *in himself* his identity as both God and man. Kenotic Christology has made much of how Jesus emptied himself and took upon himself the form of a servant. He made decisions from infancy to maturity in which this self-emptying was, in Irenaeus' terms, recapitulated. In doing so he had to grapple in the power of the Holy Spirit and against the cunning of Satan. These conflicts did not come to him in vague generalities, but in terms of his specific history and cultural background as a genuinely human being. What

were some of the components in his human history he had
to meet? How did they serve as anvils upon which he
hammered his identity into a clear sense of selfhood
through prayer with his heavenly Father?

First, he had to decide who his father was. We read the
beautiful accounts of the angel's heralding of the birth of
Jesus as the child of the Holy Spirit by the virgin, Mary.
Yet do we ask how much of his true parentage Mary her-
self communicated to her first-born son? Did his reference
to his "Father's business" in the temple story have more
specific self-definition of his identity from birth than we
usually assume? Were there any differences made between
him and his siblings by reason of Mary's very clear con-
ception of herself as the mother of her Lord? If so, what
directions of focus of this truth did in fact take place within
Jesus' self-concept as a result? Most of the answers to these
questions and many others like them, stemming from Jesus'
decisions as to his birthright and as to who his father was,
must be answered from the silence of the Scriptures, in
other words, by logic and surmise.

We know that very early in Jesus' ministry he asked
questions and gave answers which indicate some decisions
he had made. He went further and asked: "Who are my
mother and my brothers?" He answered it by saying:
"Here are my mother and my brothers! Whoever does the
will of God is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Mark
3:34-35). The decision he had apparently made was that
God was his father, and the fellowship of those who do
the will of God was the rest of his family. This is who he
was, and who he agreed to be. Obviously, also, this set him
at variance with those of his own household. Even his
mother is pictured as being mystified in her heart.

Then, upon having chosen the disciples as his larger family, Jesus was confronted with conflict and decision as to who they considered him to be. This he endured to his death. They presented to him all sorts of temptations to deny his humanity, to accept materialistic messianic roles which were of the very devil himself, to succumb to the multiple assaults of the evil one depicted in his temptations in the wilderness. This thrust him into a severe encounter with his culture itself, because these disciples were saturated with the most childlike popular notions of the Messiah and the coming kingdom prevalent in the market places of that day.

Consequently, both in the wilderness and in the days that followed, Jesus probed the Hebrew Scriptures for the meaning of his own existence. He agonized in personal prayer and confrontation of his own humanity. He made clear-cut decisions as to who his spiritual progenitors really were. We find him choosing the prophecies of the Isaiahs as the working models of his identity, as the provocateurs of the meaning which he would assign to his being, as to the quality of selfhood he would affirm. He chose to be the Suffering Servant, a selfhood which had been prepared for him and awaited his affirmation. This did not just *seem* like his decision; it *was* his decision. From that point on, his face was set, not toward Nazareth, the symbol of his past, but toward Jerusalem where he would actualize his destiny, the symbol of his living present and his eternal Selfhood as the Son of God, the Saviour of mankind.

One must be aware of what the form critics rightly call to attention: the way in which the records we now have are postresurrection reinterpretations of recalled events in Jesus' life. Yet one cannot assume that the days of Jesus'

flesh were spent in idle ignorance of the great issues of his own existence or in an aesthetic indecisiveness as to his own selfhood in the Father. He actualized a clear-cut selfhood in the choices that he made. One must express his gratitude for the real help that the form critics give in the appreciation of the depths of the changes wrought by the Resurrection and the coming of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church. However, he must at the same time avoid the docetic tendencies inherent in many of these conversations to such an extent as to make the humanity of Jesus Christ purely symbolic and the Incarnation unreal. In Pittenger's words, to do this is to make Jesus "a meaningless intrusion upon human affairs." [3] No. His Incarnation was a genuinely human existence, and his selfhood was wrought out in the processes of human choice of divine alternative, yet without sin. Therefore, he has become the High Priest who enables us to hold fast our confession and thereby come to grips with our own human history in honest encounter with him.

The Incarnate Lord and the Reconciled Self

The selfhood of man is eccentric apart from the reconciliation Christ offers. By this we mean that both the center and the circumference miss the mark of their true focus in the purpose of the Word of God in Jesus Christ. An irreconcilable tension exists, because man, as Augustine says, is made "toward God." But personal encounter with Jesus Christ decisively recenters the habitual locus of man's love through the transforming Love that Christ is. Christ "comes upon us" in our station in life. He does not come to us in some other situation than the very one we are in. He enables us with courage to face our own human

history. He accepts us as children of the parents we actually have, the ones who fathered and birthed us. He takes us with the very culture from which we sprang—namely, the place where we were born, the people with whom we grew up, the religious group in which we both conformed and rebelled, the kinds of sophistication which have both led and misled us in our education, the conflicts we have had with authority people. He does not require that we come from some other home or culture. He takes us from the race from which we sprang, not from the one from which we wish we had sprung. He takes us with the sex that was assigned us in creation—male or female—and does not require that we change this. He neither wills that we change these, nor does he will that we be enslaved by them. Rather, he intends that through the renewing of our minds by his grace we shall reinterpret the meaning of our heritage according to his intention as the New Adam of our creation in him. A clear-cut decision to be who we are and do just this does not change these things of our past, but it does change the meaning of these to us.

What, then, does Christ expect us to allow him to change? He expects us to let him move past these superficial conflicts to the deeper ones which prevent us from becoming the self that we are in his design and can be in his workmanship. He moves, with our permission, into three areas of profound conflict. In the Incarnation he brings to us the reconciliation which focuses our identity at its true center in him and enables us to begin to live a genuinely human existence. These deeper conflicts are the conflict between God and man, the conflict between the flesh and the spirit, and the conflict between self-surrender and self-realization.

The Reconciliation of God and Man

The conflict between God and man is the root of man's unreal, counterfeit, and fictitious selfhood. He wants to be as God. He rejects his own claim to selfhood, that is, his true humanity. He elevates himself to the place of God. When his childish omnipotence fails, then he begins to have all sorts of stress symptoms. His personal history is pictured in the very kinds of symptoms he has developed. If illness has historically been his way of making up for the difference between his real and his fictitious self, this will be the route he takes. If sexual irresponsibility has been his recoil from his failure to be the perfect self to which he aspires, he will return to this. If addictions to alcohol, overwork, or gambling have been his "set" to life, he will return to these. More often than not, he may develop an open and running sore of quarrelsomeness with some fellow human beings because *they* are not as *they* should be in his eyes: perfect, all-powerful, and all-wise. This may turn out to be the husband or wife of the person, or the child of a doting parent.

But whatever the set of complaints may be, the basic conflict is between the person's ambitions to be God in human form or to find God in some other human being. When these expectations collapse and the complaints appear, a person is driven in deep despair and diffuse guilt to seek help. He may turn as counselee to a pastor for spiritual care. He breaks through the wall of alienation and pseudorespectability that separates him from his pastor. Desperation propels him. Much attrition of his integrity has already taken place when he finally reaches the

pastor. Much of the sense of personal esteem has long since fled.

A part of his having waited long past the time he should have sought help lies in his false notions that the pastor himself is a paragon of virtue. He really believes that the pastor is a *good* man. Some persons go further than this. They assume that he is beyond temptation. Therefore, they conclude, a pastor is certainly not likely to understand the stresses of temptation and the weaknesses of being which beset them. Yet, courage has finally enabled them to come to him with their distress. Even now, though, a process of "deification of the pastor" continues apace. If they find him to be a kind and understanding person, they are overwhelmed with surprise. They find it incredible that the pastor can be accepting, understanding, and forgiving. They feel that a "god has come down to them in the form of man." But all the while, *he* knows that this is not true. He is a man of like passions with them. He has heard their story of their life but is "himself beset with weakness." He too has a history of sin. He cannot fulfill without guilt and anxiety their desire that he play God.

On the other hand, other counselees invariably will have severe problems in accepting the pastor as a genuinely human person. They prefer their illusion of his deity. They test his patience and make inordinate demands upon him. They look upon him as the "one from whom all blessings flow." They goad his human limitations beyond the point of bearability. In doing so, their own childish desires to be "god" return to the surface. With many such persons making such demands upon a pastor, he is likely to give way under the strain. He is comforted in the knowledge that Moses also gave way. He reads of Moses' complaining to

God: "Why hast thou dealt ill with thy servant? And why have I not found favor in thy sight, that thou dost lay the burden of all this people upon me? . . . I am not able to carry all this people alone, the burden is too heavy for me" (Numbers 11:11, 14). The contradictory demands that he as a shepherd of the flock be *both God and man* clutch him with ambiguity.

The coming of Jesus Christ as *both God and man* speaks as a unique revelation to this conflict between the need to be God and the need to be man. When one asks: *"Cur deus homo?"* (Why the God man?), the Christian pastor knows more than other people how important the question is. The high-priesthood of Jesus provides the ground of being upon which all other shepherds of the flock stand as priests to bring hope of reconciliation of this conflict between self-humiliation and self-elevation to men.

Athanasius spoke to this very dilemma in his discussion of the Incarnation. He insisted that if we believe that "the Word of God is in the whole universe, and that the whole is illumined and moved by him (we should not think it absurd that a single human body also should receive movement and light from him) . . . For man also . . . is a part of the whole. . . . For humanity too is an actual part of the whole." Hence, says Athanasius, it cannot be absurd that God has chosen to speak fully in Christ as a man, "and used as his instrument a human body to manifest the truth and knowledge of the Father." [4]

Even though, as Athanasius says, the genuinely human is a part of the whole of God's creation, this does not mean that it is not fraught with ambiguity, self-elevation, and sin. The entry of Christ into the very form of man was no easy matter. The humanity into which he entered was un-

redeemed, disrupted, and at cross purposes with itself. Self-defeat was the result of its highest aspiration. This defeat is symbolized in Adam and overcome in Christ, for, as Wilhelm Pauck says in interpreting Karl Barth, "Christ is the true head of all humanity, Adam included—the triumphant head of that humanity which, beginning with Adam's transgression, is doomed to death because all its members have sinned and do sin like Adam." [5] And, as Barth reminds us, we cannot look backward or forward to some golden age of humanity. As far as we can look in either direction, man apart from Christ is first, last, and always a sinner, incapable of accepting himself. [6]

Yet God's redemptive action in Jesus Christ moves toward man and at the same time initiates a movement upward within man toward God. P. T. Forsyth describes it as a "vertical action, so to say, in which man is constantly seeking unto a God and God is constantly passing into man." [7] God in Christ ministers to men in this double movement of our existence and, as Forsyth points out, this movement in the divine human encounter is one "whose movements produce much friction." [8] Neither a counselor himself nor his counselees can offer each other the ultimate hope of the reconciliation of both their conflictual needs *for* God and their temptations to *be* God. Neither the number of interviews they use nor how "deep" or "fearless" they go in self-contrived security can resolve this conflict. They must have some "rock" of security beyond themselves. The Incarnate Christ provides this in his Person as *both* God and man.

Christ confronts both counselor and counselee in the reality of the unchangeable past. He presents them with the major crises of the self day by day as the decisive *kairoi*

of existence. The time is at hand when a decision is required as to which self is the self of Christ's own choosing. The images of the self taught one by parent, sibling, teacher, or pastor may or may not be the true estimate Christ in his forgiveness brings to bear upon our human history. Rainer Maria Rilke has a child say in his "The Song of a Waif":

> I am nobody and always will be.
> I am almost too little to live, right now,
> and even later.
> O mothers and fathers,
> have pity on me.
> But it's not worth your bother:
> I'll still be mowed down.
> No one can use me: it's too early. Wait
> until tomorrow—then it's too late.[9]

But in the decisive encounter with Jesus Christ these valuations are dramatically torn away and his estimate of our selves becomes normative. We are no longer "nobodies," but persons for whom God has released power in Jesus Christ to become sons of God. He has not left us as waifs, but has made his home with us in Christ. This calls for a decisive break with the luxury of self-pity and the undisciplined side-benefits of considering ourselves as "nonentities." Someone can use us, and it is neither too early nor too late. The decisive moment is at hand to believe the astonishingly difficult thing to believe: that we are forgiven and accepted when we can neither forgive nor accept ourselves. The threat of condemnation is effectually dealt with as Christ helps our unbelief in the presence of this good news. Christ can help belief that grows

from astonishment of this kind. But he does so by mobiliz-
ing the forces of decision within us. As Forsyth again says,
"A true psychology of religion leaves us at last face to face
with a choice and a venture . . . in the sense of a decision;
the decision, namely, that what we feel facing us, urging
us, dominating us is not an illusion but the presence and
action of a transcendent reality." [10]

Oscar Cullman comments that the writer of Hebrews
"had the courage to speak of Christ in shockingly human
terms." He could not have challenged man at the heart of
his decisions without being more genuinely human than
we in our fictitious self-images and elevated pride would
dare to be. This is why his humanity shocks us. We have
such terrible difficulty in accepting the Incarnation be-
cause we ourselves would be ashamed to stoop as low as
Christ did in becoming human. Our own sinful pride
would have prevented it. We would have been ashamed of
being a Nazarene; we would have sought to be "upwardly
mobile" in ways which did not concern him. The author of
Hebrews says that Jesus "had to be made like his brethren
in every respect. . . ." But the Apostle Paul pushes the
truth to its depths. He says that Christ became obedient
unto death. All of us do this whether we want to or not.
But then Paul adds: "even the death of the cross." Jesus
went to the *nth* degree of being human, not *just* in every
respect as we are human. This makes him the Christus
Victor, the one who has gone ahead of us even in the day-
to-day task of being human. Therefore, he becomes the
High Priest of us in our common humanity and in the
unique personal ways each one of us has of sinning. For
each one of us, in his particular autobiography, has parted
his own way, too. And, in Cullman's words again, "in order

to lead humanity to its completeness," the High Priest himself went "through the various stages of human life" at a depth of participation we ourselves rarely approach, much less really go through.[11]

Consequently, in the reconciliation of God and man in Christ, we can freely approach him as the God-man, our true Confessor. We need no longer seek to amputate our past. There is a difference between denying our past and having our past forgiven in such a way as to be able to live with it a transformed life. In the Incarnate Christ, we focus our past in a new selfhood of Christ's forgiving love. We exercise our freedom by the acceptance of the decisions we have already made and of the new meaning with which Christ endows these decisions. Life becomes more genuinely human, more vital, plainer, and simpler when by faith in Christ this is so.

The Reconciliation of Flesh and Spirit

The Incarnation of God in Christ, in the second place, once and for all overcame the conflict between the flesh and the spirit. These two symbols of human meaning depict in another way the rift in man's selfhood. The Hebrews used the terms "flesh" and "spirit," as we translate them, to refer to the distance and relationship between God the Creator and God the creature. When men live the corruptible life of the flesh, they actualize the gulf, the chasm, the abyss between them and their Creator-God. This does not represent so much *a division within the self as an alienation of the self from God.* This alienation in turn infects the motives of man. He becomes double-minded, adulterous (in the theological sense of idolatry), and unstable in all his ways. But the root of the ambiva-

lence is his alienation from God. By his own self-sufficiency man deliberately places distance between himself and God. This deliberately chosen separation is sin. Sin prevents any true focus of man's identity in God. He has become a wanderer from his home in God, a lost sheep of the house of Israel, and a stranger to the commonwealth of God. The Incarnation of God in Christ overcomes this estrangement. God takes the initiative and makes his home with man. God finds his sheep as only a good shepherd does. He "draws nigh unto man" that man may draw nigh unto him. His purpose is to re-establish the fellow citizenry of "the household of God." This is the focus of man's identity through the Incarnation.

In this sense, the Incarnation of God in Christ reconciles the flesh and the spirit. "The spirit" symbolizes man in his fellowship with God, wherein the total being—body and spirit—is redeemed. In Christ God has made his dwelling place with man. He has transcended man's loneliness in his all-inclusive love. He speaks to our alienation from each other and commands us to love one another as he has loved us. He has reconciled the flesh and the spirit in that we "who once were far off have been brought near in the blood of Jesus Christ." As Paul further says, "he is our peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end" (Ephesians 2:13-16). In his own flesh he reconciled the estranged ones. The lonely ones have found communion in him.

The pastor is uniquely responsible for being aware of the isolation and loneliness at the core of the disturbed and disoriented persons who seek his and other counselors' help. He cannot accept responsibility for removing medical symptoms. Nor can he, without violating the nature of the ministry and of his commission in Christ, dull his awareness of and response to the loneliness and isolation which these symptoms both symbolize and seek to perpetuate. Anton Boisen has put all pastors in his debt for calling attention to the isolation and estrangement which lies at the "eye of the storm" of schizophrenia. He proposes that pastors need something more than just techniques and practices with which to encounter this isolation and estrangement. Boisen will be satisfied only with "trying to answer the really significant questions from the standpoint of theology." [12]

The theological answer of the "really significant question" of man's estrangement is the reconciliation of this "distance" in the flesh of the man Christ Jesus. He is more than just a *symbol* of the reconciliation of flesh and spirit, and of man with man. He *is* the reconciliation itself. He *is* our peace. He does not just picture or symbolize our peace. The pastor, as he flies into the eye of the storm of man's diseases of shattered and rifted selfhood, must be borne up by something more than just his knowledge of flying and of weather. The very body and blood of the reconciling Christ himself *is* that something more.

In the second place, the "flesh and spirit" was seen by the Greeks very differently as contrasted with the Hebrew perspective. They did not see it as the alienation of the creature in his distance from the Creator. They saw the flesh and the spirit as the antagonistic opposition of the

material, dark, obstreperous, and evil body to the imma-
terial, light, rational, and good soul. These two were as
eternally at odds with each other as the "bleary-eyed mon-
ster" and the "noble steed" tied together in Plato's allegory
of the chariot and the charioteer. The only solution the
Greeks could propose was a complete separation. This
could finally be effected in immortality beyond death, and
only then. Reconciliation was unthinkable; only purgation
and annihilation of the body provided any hope of re-
demption. The end result of this was *either* in Dionysian
orgies of those who despaired of the contemplative life of
the spirit *or* in the rigorous asceticism of those who com-
pletely eschewed the flesh. The nearest possible step to-
ward reconciliation was the philosophy of the Golden
Mean in which men indulged the appetites "just enough
to put them to sleep," as Plato put it.

The proclamation of early Christian preaching met this
widespread meaning attached to the "flesh and the spirit"
long before the New Testament canon had been finished.
Evidences of it appear both as belief and as heresy in the
New Testament. But the preponderant pattern is one of
rejection. The Epistles of John present this as a challenge
to the very essence of the Christian message. Jesus Christ
had reconciled the flesh and the spirit in exactly this sense,
the Johannine epistles insist. By this we are to know the
Spirit of God, says John: "Every spirit which confesses that
Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God, and every
spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God" (I John
4:2-3). Jesus' Incarnation was not just an apparent hu-
manity, but full and complete.

The rejection of gnostic denials of the humanity of Jesus
turned upon the solid conviction of the early Christians

that both flesh and spirit had been reconciled in Jesus Christ, making the same reconciliation possible for us. Ignatius (circa 107) preached the theme clearly and with triumph. He said that Christ is "the one Healer . . . both fleshly and spiritual, born and unborn." [13] In this reconciliation, Christ brought forth in us "the new man," "God appearing in the form of man unto newness of eternal life." [14] Anders Nygren summarizes the early church doctrine when he says: "Redemption means, not that God in Christ gives us instructions and an example of how to free ourselves from the conditions of our temporal life and raise ourselves up to fellowship with Him, but that God in his love has condescended to us, entered into our temporal conditions, and instituted fellowship with us." [15]

This basic Christian doctrine has held firm through centuries of Christian controversy. However, Christ's reconciliation of the flesh and the spirit has been misinterpreted by much psychotherapeutic and popular discussion of the Christian faith. Also, popular folk religions which often like to claim distinctly Christian rootage have caused their share of the confusion. Freud attributed ascetic rejection of the body to Victorian religious preachment. All the while he drew the main body of his own mythology from Greek literature, the selfsame source of the dualism which he so roundly decried.[16]

But William G. Cole has successfully challenged this assumption through careful historical research in his book, *Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis*.[17] The ontological dualism of the Gnostics separated the flesh from the spirit, a kind of doctrine that declares the Incarnation of Jesus Christ null and void. The eschatological dualism of the Christian faith declares that God has become man in the

flesh in the fullness of time. In the early church, this escha-
tology reduced the importance of more mundane pursuits,
such as marriage, because of the shortness of time before
the impending *parousia*. This dualism has been based upon
a sense of the shortness of time, not upon an ontology
which divides the world into matter and spirit.

However, psychoanalysis has been extremely helpful in
challenging the perversion of Christian doctrine which has
permitted a Gnostic division of the flesh from the spirit to
become the base for much popular Christian moralism
about the evils of the biological functions of the body. The
reconciliation of the flesh and the spirit is exactly what
happened in Christ. Faith in Christ is a wholehearted com-
mitment of the total self, not just body and not just spirit,
to God. The total biological history of the individual as a
child of God, created male and female, with a destiny of
total fulfillment in responsible stewardship under God is
called into focus in Christian redemption. The decision to
become a Christian is a total presentation to God, a *spirit-
ual* service. And, as Bultmann, Rust, Robinson, and others
have consistently said, the word "body," or *soma*, as it is
used in the majority of instances in the New Testament,
really means "total self," not just the chemical residue of
the human being. Thus in the reconciliation of flesh and
spirit, salvation is the focus of the whole identity—both
flesh and spirit, in the Greek sense—into the one, total dedi-
cation of the self to God. The human body is the temple
of the Holy Spirit, and we are to present our total self unto
God as a spiritual service.

This has much to say about our interpretation of sin,
also, in the focus of a man's identity in his estimate of him-
self as a sinner. Too often sin has been identified with the

flesh to the exclusion of the more subtle kinds of sin. However, the catalogues of the works of the flesh include such sins as envy and deception. In the Incarnation, the total self is under judgment, not merely the acts associated with the appetites of hunger, thirst, or sex. Yet an unreconciled flesh and spirit has too often been adopted as a way of life in the name of Christ. Otherwise pious people provoke their neighbors into grosser offenses by their definition of sin as being only these kinds of transgressions. The harsh judgmentalism of those who are ready to cast the first stone at those who have erred with their appetites reveals a rift in their own selfhood. They have substituted Greek antagonism of flesh and spirit for Christian reconciliation of the two in the one Being of Jesus Christ, the one flesh of Christian marriage, and the one God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The selfhood so defined is a partial, incomplete, and only partially committed selfhood. Such commitment leaves the very vitality of the history of an individual or community buried by fear in a field. The result is poor stewardship and censure by the Lord who gave us these gifts. For, as I Timothy puts it in answer to those who on the basis of such teachings forbade marriage and prescribed abstinence from foods: "God created [these things] to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and know the truth. For everything created by God is good, and nothing is to be rejected if it is received with thanksgiving; for then it is consecrated by the word of God and prayer" (I Timothy 4:3-5).

The pastor and theologian is helped considerably by the reaffirmation of the wholeness of personality which contemporary psychologists have so forcefully brought to his

attention. Particularly helpful have been the *Gestalt* psychologists and field theorists more generally. Yet a more radical corrective even than this is needed. The minister is likely not to look with a critical eye at his own failure to probe the systematic and historical implications of his personal faith in Christ. The first- and second-century apologists were not just theorizing when they with the commitment of Ignatius were led out to execution for what they believed. They were securing an exposition of the Christian faith which insisted that God took the form of a man, a human being. Therefore, the total human self is accessible to and redeemable by Christ, not just part of it. Seeberg quotes Ignatius: "As he was 'being led out to execution,' he said: 'Let me go to find the pure light. Arriving there, I shall be a man.'" (Ignatius: Romans 6:2; 5:3; 2:2). A knowledge of modern psychology calls these things to our attention; but closer scrutiny reflects that our basic belief in Christ as the reconciler of flesh and spirit needs the help of the ancients as well.

The Reconciliation of Self-Surrender and Self-Realization

The selfhood of man is pulled contrariwise by another conflict: the contradiction between the need to give himself in abandon and self-surrender and his need to realize himself in a selfhood of his own making. The reconciliation of this contrariety in his being is beyond his own strength. The Christian witnesses to the reconciliation of this conflict in the Incarnation of God in Christ. This conflict is embedded in the structure of selfhood and culture, particularly with American people. Gardner Murphy aptly puts it when he calls this "a fundamental ethical paradox

[which] cannot be intelligently banished by shoulder-shrugging." He infers that we are in a "psychological muddle of big proportions" because we cannot psychologically "adjust the paradox," namely, that "human nature is really capable of effective functioning" only under conditions of personal self-fulfillment, and "at the same time . . . the nature of man [is] so to lose himself in others as to care little or nothing about the enhancement of the self." This paradox, Murphy says, is extolled by Christianity, which in turn does nothing to adjust the paradox but "leaves us in confusion."[18]

Reinhold Niebuhr says, however, in commenting on this remark of Murphy, that "the confusion is rather in Mr. Murphy's mind." The confusion arises, in my own opinion, out of Murphy's attempt to "adjust the paradox" on a purely logical basis with no intervening theological truth to transform the paradox into a more profound and less superficial description of the reality at stake. His statement fails to reveal this depth. Furthermore, such an intervening theological truth would do more than simply *adjust* the paradox, for it is more than a paradox: it is a straight contradiction. Adjustment is not enough; reconciliation and nothing less will do. The Incarnation of Jesus Christ, culminating in his crucifixion, effects this reconciliation. Prudent calculation and technical adjustment of the self do not stop to consider, much less to make central to the need for reconciliation, the reality of the crucifixion. Niebuhr again has said, "Sacrificial love is a 'scandal' in any system of prudential ethics." [19] But, just as the contradiction between self-fulfillment and self-realization is embedded in the reality of the human condition, also the Cross of Jesus Christ is embedded in

the reality of the reconciliation of this contradiction. Jesus said that ". . . the Son of man must suffer many things . . . and be killed, and after three days rise again. And he said this plainly. . . . And he called to him the multitude with his disciples, and said to them, 'If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. For whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it. For what does it profit a man, to gain the whole world and forfeit his life? For what can a man give in return for his life?'" (Mark 8: 31, 32, 34-37).

The Cross, culmination of Christ's Incarnation, is the answer of Christ to the contradiction between self-surrender and self-fulfillment. Yet this is not done, brought about, or even initiated by man. Anders Nygren poses the contradiction about which we have been talking by pointing to the wide and unbridgeable gap between Agape and Eros. Whether it is Plato's "vulgar" Eros or his "heavenly" Eros, in either instance, Nygren insists, this kind of love is the aspiration of the selfhood of man, originating in man's restlessness, anxiety, and desire. Agape, on the other hand and to the contrary, is spontaneous and unmotivated, indifferent to the worthiness of the loved object, and is the creative initiation of God in Christ for fellowship with man. "*Agape is God's way to man,*" says Nygren; it is God's fulfillment of man's life. And "after Christ's sacrifice on the Cross we can no longer speak adequately of God's Agape without referring to the Cross of Christ, any more than we can speak of Christ's love, shown in his death, without seeing in it God's own love." [20]

Nygren patiently develops a motif-research into the encounter of Christian Agape in the proclamation of the

unmerited love of God with the Platonic and Neo-Platonic conceptions of Eros in pre-Augustinian life of the church. These motifs simply collided. The Christian witness of the gift of God's love and kingdom in Christ plainly contradicted the Hellenistic assumption that by purgation and self-improvement man could somehow actualize a divinity already within him. This latter motif Nygren calls Eros; the former, Agape. However, Nygren pushes his scheme so hard as to make a true reconciliation in man's redemption by Christ virtually impossible. However, he helps one to see vividly the nature of this contradiction.

The contradiction between God's command for self-commitment in response to his own free gift of love, on the one hand, and man's self-affirmation, aspiration, and even elevation, on the other hand, was not really resolved by Christian theologians until Augustine. Augustine accented the creaturely, self-centered ambiguity of all human love. He differentiated kinds of human love, however, by using the terms *caritas* and *cupiditas*. "*Caritas is love directed upward . . . love of God.*" "*Cupiditas is love directed downward, . . . love of the world.*" The one is the love of the eternal and the other is the love of the temporal. In other words, they are distinguishable from each other *by their object*, not by their origin and nature. In *caritas*, then, we find *rest*, reconciliation, peace. This calls for a choice, a choice and a decision between loving the eternal and the temporal, between *caritas* and *cupiditas*. *Caritas*, by its nature, is directionally at one with man's destiny in God; *cupiditas*, by its nature is for the same reason at variance with man's destiny in God. In the act of self-commitment, self-realization of his deepest destiny is brought to pass. Agape and Eros meet in peace.

Another way Augustine synthesizes Agape and Eros is through his distinction between *frui,* that is, *to enjoy* or love something for its own sake, and *uti,* namely, *to use* or love something *for the sake of something else.*[21] God loves us for our own sakes. He expects this kind of response from us. Through Christ we are empowered to respond this way. However, being creatures, men and not God, we are captured by the abounding love of God in that we must confess that it is our own loss if we do not love him and to love him is to gain a new love for ourselves.[22] But in these qualitatively different actions of love, *frui* and *uti,* we have a clearer way of understanding the qualities of love, *caritas* and *cupiditas.* Nygren contrasts them thus: *Caritas enjoys God and uses the world; cupiditas enjoys the world and uses God.* As Augustine himself said: "Good men use the world in order to enjoy God, whereas bad men want to use God in order to enjoy the world." [23] This is the difference between a self-surrender that grovels in asceticism in order to be seen of men and a self-surrender that loses itself in adoration of God for his gift of Christ. This is the difference between a self-fulfill-ment that is fraught with narcissism and personal indul-gence and a self-fullfillment in participating in the very destiny and calling for which one was made by God from the beginnings of his history.

However, these profound and even mysterious differ-ences are usually obscured when the focus of our attention is on either *our* self-surrender, *our* self-fulfillment, or *our* confusion as to the contradiction between the two. By following hard after any one of the three, we focus our attention downward and away from the reality of the Cross of Jesus Christ. We concentrate our attention upon

our own inner ambiguity. We fall prey to the sin of grasp-
ing after self-surrender, self-fulfillment, or clarification of
our confusion "too immediately and too clamantly." And,
Niebuhr trenchantly observes: "We are thus involved in,
even if we do not consciously recognize the validity of, the
law of love. We may not recognize this contradiction be-
tween our acceptance of the law and our inevitable be-
trayal of it, except when we consider ourselves ultimately,
that is, in prayer." [24] Then Paul's utterance that the things
he would do, he does not, and the things he would not
do are the very things he does, describes our inner situ-
ation. The decision to be Christian brings all one's am-
bitions and self-aspirations to focus.

The self-expression of God in the Incarnate Love of the
Logos overwhelms the conflict between man's need for
self-surrender and his need for self-realization in what
Augustine called *caritas*. Nygren drives his distinction
betwen Agape and Eros so hard as to make the two com-
pletely irreconcilable, so that the love that comes from
man is always antithetical and alien to the Love that
comes from God. He concludes that the synthesis which
Augustine describes had ultimately to be smashed by
Luther.[25] But this does violence to the nature of the rec-
onciliation which takes place in the Incarnation. It denies
the power of God in Christ to work through the love of
man. It does violence furthermore to the basic wisdom of
Augustine. The self-actualization which takes place rep-
resents the co-operative enterprise of God above and God
within our history. Etienne Gilson appropriately asks
concerning Nygren's kind of interpretation: If God is love,
"how are we to reach God if we must already possess
Him in order to reach Him?" He answers it by saying that

God is within us by the same grace that he is in heaven. It is, Gilson says, "from within that God confers movement and life upon the soul." [26]

This is true even today in the gauntlet which psychoanalysis has thrown down before Christianity in this century. At first the findings of psychoanalysts were used to demonstrate the damage done by the loveless legalism of those who "use religion and try to use God" to achieve their own mundane and self-centered aims. In almost reverse prophetism, they challenged our idolatry. Then we hastened to set aside the pathway of "rejectionists" for the selfhood of a permissive self-acceptance. Men like Joshua Loth Liebman and, to a less extent, Paul Johnson insisted that self-love was a prerequisite to health, love of neighbor, and love of God. Nontheologically oriented and/or humanist behavioral scientists hold this as truism today. But this in turn has caused pastoral theologians to ask what has gone with the distinctive elements of self-commitment, self-surrender, and obedience in the Christian interpretation of life.

These questions will not be realistically answered, and the kinds of confusion of which Gardner Murphy complains will be the order of the day until we once again can transcend our easy dichotomies which put God completely beyond the creation, which we have only recently named "nature." The clear proclamation of the revelation of God in Christ, "reconciling the world to himself" accentuates the transcendent Love of God as the unqualified and unmerited acceptance which is not conditioned by our personal inadequacies. But it also "tabernacles" him *within* human nature and its power to love. The Incarnation reveals that "the self is bound to

destroy itself by seeking itself too narrowly, that it must forget itself to realize itself." We are pushed even more deeply by the Incarnate Love of Christ: self-forgetfulness cannot be of a calculating kind. It is not moved by the hidden assumption that "a more ultimate form of self-realization will flow from forgetfulness." [27]

The gospel of sacrificial love, made real in the Incarnate Crucifixion of Christ, stands at the heart of the grace that brings man new selfhood. The contradiction of self-surrender and self-realization is overcome in personal participation in this gospel. The Apostle Paul bore witness to it when he said: "I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh, I live by faith in the son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me" (Galatians 2:20). Yet this entails a kind of suffering the like of which is only occasionally included in contemporary estimates of man's selfhood. The risks involved in the venture of decision and faith entail a kind of suffering of which the managed perfections of both *moralistic* religion and *predictive* psychologies are not too aware.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer, a Christian pastor, and Klaus Konrad, a psychiatrist, encountered the abyss of peril in the closing days of World War II in Germany. Both, in their own ways, were remarkably aware of the risk and abandon involved in total commitment to Christ. Bonhoeffer has been held before our attention often, but Klaus Konrad's words are not so well known. Shortly after World War II he as a practicing psychiatrist contributed a brief article to a book entitled *World Tension: The Psychopathology of International Relations.*[28] He speaks of the "diabolical circular motion" in which men seek, not just self-realiza-

tion, but self-aggrandizement, that is, self-elevation at
the expense of others. He locates the problem of mankind,
not in the conflict between self-surrender or self-realiza-
tion, but in the third factor of exploitation of others for
power's sake. "Wherever anyone," he says, "has obtained
even a trace of power over others he has sold his soul to
the devil." [29] This becomes a vicious circle in which man
is trapped like a rat; in fact, we speak of the competitive
"rat race." We have a strange feeling of modernity about
the Cappadocian Fathers' answer to the question of "why
the God-man?" with the affirmation that Christ's atone-
ment releases men from the trap of the devil by the ransom
he pays for us. As Konrad further depicts the selfhood of
man, this becomes more vivid: "might and right, violence
and lawfulness, egocentricity and objectivity, self-asser-
tion and self-denial are inseparably intertwined in the
communal life of individuals." [30] The "law of the cycle"
operates whereby tension between persons increases with
a "self-perpetuating potential." What can break this?

Konrad says that the "diabolical circle can only be
broken by a new and opposing principle . . . quite alien
to the primordial, naïve, instinctual, unconscious, and in-
fantile psychical realm." This principle "originates in an
entirely different universe, namely the universe of spiritual-
ity." [31] This principle rests upon renunciation. On the
national level, and on any smaller corporate level, the
principle of renunciation is held to be invalid, binding only
on individuals, not groups and nations. The principle of
renunciation "was proclaimed two thousand years ago as
a new gospel and provided a great surprise for people of
that time," says Konrad: "the demand that we substitute
gentleness for force, love for hatred, forgiveness for re-
venge, asceticism for lust and self-denial for possessive-

ness." [32] Konrad concludes that this would be a miracle which "may yet come, because man is not only of bestial but divine origin . . . life is stronger than death, but sacrifice of life stronger than life." Dietrich Bonhoeffer's martyrdom lives as a testimony to this miracle's real possibility in Christ.

The restless self is reconciled by such a faith. The glory of being human is felt. Kierkegaard speaks of the glory of the lily which God has arrayed in the simplicity of its response to and dependence upon him. In symbolically applying this to the life of man who through faith finds the simplification and clarification of his existence, Kierkegaard says: "Being clothed means being human—and so to be well clothed." Our struggles for power, our complicated treasuries of our differences from other people, our "accumulated multitude of comparisons to those about us" make us "more and more men . . . like miners, who never see the light of day." Even so we are the unfortunate ones. We "never come to see the light: those elevating, simple thoughts about how glorious it is to be human." [33]

Such simplicity arises in the beyond-the-cross situation, not in its prior anticipation. This entails some very awkward and painful situations when we have the opportunity to *profess* our faith in Jesus Christ. This profession of faith, Kierkegaard insists, is *"identical with proclaiming Christianity."* [34] Such a confession is not the divulging of some criminal act, but the confession that one is a Christian. *This is his selfhood!* From this perspective, both the minister and the counselee cease to be concerned with the "accumulated multitude of comparisons between them" in the confessional situation. They take their stance in a kindred selfhood with each other. Both are sinners and both are sustained by the same act of God Incarnate in

Jesus Christ. Christ becomes to them both the Friend, the friend who loved them both before he knew them. The communion which Christ creates between them makes their friendship a genuinely human existence. They are no longer simply clothed in the glory of their humanity. They have "put on" Christ. They participate in his divine Being. In him the categories of time are transcended. The life history becomes present fact, and present fact is reconciled. Christ's friendship supersedes the narrow dichotomies between men that make their ambitions run riot: Jew and Greek, slave and free, male and female, and—one might add—counselor and counselee. The Incarnate Christ hears our confessions of our competitive struggles for self-realization and our burden of unfulfillment for not having found that focus of our identity that will lift us to the abandon of self-commitment. He becomes that New Being in whom we may feel the very friendship of God through faith in him. Shakespeare describes it thus in Sonnet XXX:

> When to the sessions of sweet silent thought
> I summon up remembrance of things past,
> I sigh the lack of many a thing I sought,
> And with old woes new wail my dear times' waste:
> Then can I drown an eye, unused to flow,
> For precious friends hid in death's dateless night,
> And weep afresh love's long-since cancelled woe,
> And moan the expense of many a vanished sight:
> Then I can grieve at grievances foregone,
> And heavily from woe to woe tell o'er
> The sad account of fore-bemoanéd moan,
> Which I new pay as if not paid before.
> But if the while I think on thee, dear friend,
> All losses are restored and sorrows end.

The Incarnate Christ enables us to summon up remembrance of things past, not only "all the things we ever did," but also "whatsoever things he has taught us." The one is filled with grief and the threat of condemnation. The other overcomes this grief and threat with the reinterpretation of our life's story through the instruction of the Holy Spirit. Our history of sin focuses our selfhood in the forgiving act of Christ. We are from now on, not the "righteous ones" but the forgiven ones. Our self-commitment in response to his forgiveness brings us to a new level of encounter with him as he anoints us to the "high calling of God" in our true vocation.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER TWO

1. W. Norman Pittenger, *The Word Incarnate* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), p. 215.
2. Paul Tillich, *A History of Christian Thought* (Private but copyrighted publication. 2nd Edition. Recorded and edited by Peter John, 1956), p. 269.
3. Pittenger, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
4. Athanasius, "On the Incarnation," *Christology of the Later Fathers*, E. R. Hardy, ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954), pp. 96-97.
5. Wilhelm Pauck, Introduction to *Christ and Adam*, Karl Barth (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), p. 8.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
7. *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, p. 334. (See documentation in Note 10 below.)
8. *Ibid.*
9. Rainer Maria Rilke, *Selected Poems*, C. F. MacIntyre, tr. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1958), p. 53. By permission.
10. P. T. Forsyth, *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1909), p. 334. The experience of psychoanalysts in World War II has opened the whole discipline of psycho-

therapy to the influence of existential thinking. The role of decision and a heightened awareness of the importance of time in relation to the *kairoi* of existence are being realistically considered as a part of therapy rather than something that should be suspended while therapy takes place. As a result, confrontation with responsibility in the present is being held in an increasingly more realistic balance with the analysis of historical and genetic factors in one's past. The minister can appreciate the importance of this change of emphasis and at the same time watch for reactions to the other extreme when analysts not trained in the rigorous disciplines of the analysis of developmental factors will tend to neglect the power of the past to destroy the individual's hope in the present.

11. Oscar Cullman, *The Christology of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), p. 93.
12. Quoted from personal correspondence.
13. Ignatius, Ephesians 7:2.
14. Reinhold Seeberg, *Textbook of the History of Doctrines*, C. E. Hay, tr. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1956), p. 65.
15. From *Agape and Eros* by Anders Nygren, tr. Philip Watson. Published 1953, The Westminster Press. By permission. (Part 2, Vol. I, p. 207 in S.P.C.K. edition, 1938.)
16. Sigmund Freud, "Civilized Sexual Morality and Modern Nervousness," *Collected Papers*, Ernest Jones, ed. (New York: Basic Books, 1959), Vol. II, pp. 76-79.
17. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.
18. Gardner Murphy, *Personality: A Biosocial Approach* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947), pp. 924-925.
19. Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Self and the Dramas of History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955), p. 32.
20. Anders Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, Part I, P. S. Watson, tr. (London: S.P.C.K., copyright 1932 by The Westminster Press), pp. 75-81, 118, in the S.P.C.K. edition.
21. *De Doctrina Christiana*, Book I, Chap. xxii, 20. Quoted by Nygren, *ibid.*, p. 504.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 539.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 506.
24. Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Self and the Dramas of History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955), p. 233. By permission.
25. See Nygren, *op. cit.*, pp. 561-562.

26. Etienne Gilson, *The Christian Philosophy of St. Augustine* (New York: Random House, Inc., 1960), p. 164.
27. Reinhold Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, p. 232.
28. George W. Kisker, ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1951).
29. *Ibid.*, p. 90.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 89.
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
33. Søren Kierkegaard, *The Gospel of Suffering*, D. F. and L. M. Swenson, trs. (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1948), pp. 206-207.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 140.

The Anointed One and Our Christian Vocation

> The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord (Isaiah 61:1 and Luke 4:18-19, KJV).

The Incarnate Christ focuses man's identity through the forgiveness of his history of sin. His redemption does not change the past but sets in motion a continuing reinterpretation of the meaning of the past. Old things are passed away, but all things are made new in the birth of Christian selfhood through the grace of God in Christ. The hitherto irreconcilable conflicts between the need to be God and the need to be human, the need to reject either the flesh or the spirit, and the need to commit one's life and at the same time to realize one's self apart from God are brought to a higher resolution in the paradox of grace in the Incarnate Lord. All this we have said in the previous chapter.

Yet Christian redemption in all its decisive, "once-for-allness" is never a static redemption. Christian selfhood

74

once initiated through faith nevertheless undergoes further focusing and definition in continued encounter with Christ. The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to discuss the encounter of man with Christ, "The Anointed One," in the decisive focus of man's selfhood in the Christian calling. The first criterion for distinguishing a real encounter with Christ from an only seeming or even specious encounter with Christ is, "Did this encounter bring about an agonizing and meaningful reappraisal of one's personal history that eventuated in a clear awareness of God's forgiveness and a new interpretation of one's spiritual autobiography?" The second criterion for distinguishing a real encounter with Christ from an unauthentic one is, "Did this person as a true self in Christ come to clear decision as to *who* Christ is, as to *who* Christ would have him *to be* and what Christ would have him *to do* with his life?" Man receives selfhood through the forgiveness of Christ. He discovers the true dimensions and directions of his selfhood in encounter with Christ, the Anointed One, who enables him to clarify his own Christian calling. Without this, even the experience of forgiveness itself is abortive, like the seed of the gospel which fell on "stony places" and "withered away", "when the sun was up." No authentic experience of forgiveness leaves one without a deep inner healing. In this healing resides the purpose of the Christ, the Anointed One. He was sent to heal, to preach good news, and to release men from bondage. Thereby he brings into being man's Christian calling in the very act of his redemption. The "whenness" of this which preoccupies the speculators on this and that ecclesiastical market should never be allowed to obscure the "thatness" of Christian calling *in* the experience of redemption.

These transitional remarks state basic hypotheses which provide a pattern for this portion of the discussion of the encounter of man with Christ as one who was "sent" and who enables man to attain true selfhood in his "anointing." We need to explore Christ's own decisive focus of his identity in his awareness of himself as the Anointed One, or the Messiah. In other words, we need to ask and answer as best we can: "What *did* Jesus think of himself and what were some of his stresses in arriving at this selfhood?" Then we need to ask: "How does his authentic mission and true selfhood encounter us in the stringent *meaninglessness* of our existence?" Whereas Jesus as Emmanuel focuses our selfhood at the point of our identity as sinners and need for forgiveness, Jesus as the Anointed One addresses us at the point of the meaninglessness of our sufferings in our need for a distinct calling and vocation. Then, in conclusion, we shall need to summarize the discussion with a discussion of Christian calling and clarity of selfhood.

The Focus of Jesus' Identity as the Anointed One

Who did Jesus think he was? How did he decide in his communion with the Father through the fellowship of the Holy Spirit to define his own selfhood? These are crucial questions both for Christological thinking and for the clarification of man's own selfhood. Jesus defined his own calling as the Anointed One through his relationship to the same kind of specific community every person experiences. In this he shared more than his portion of our humanity, also.

Jesus and His Mother. For example, the first and most important "other" self whom an individual encounters in

his pilgrimage of the self is his mother. Jesus was no exception. His mother, according to the report of the Matthew and Luke accounts, had some specific interpretations of her own to give to the identity of Jesus. She saw herself as the handmaid of the Lord, an obedient and consecrated servant of the word of the Lord. She saw herself as the participant instrument of the Holy Spirit in his part in the birth. She identified herself with Hannah in the Magnificat and saw her child as not merely being "lent unto the Lord," but as being conceived by the Holy Spirit himself. She validated this experience by the conversation with her cousin Elisabeth.

We ask, therefore, How much of this sense of identity did Mary communicate to Jesus himself? If she communicated the content of her Magnificat to him either directly or indirectly, we can see the prophetic dimensions of her instruction of her child: In his coming, God had "scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts" and "shown his strength." He had reversed the world's power structures, "putting down the mighty from their thrones" and "exalting those of low degree." God had identified himself with the hungry and sent the rich away empty. (See Luke 1:26-55.) The predominant motifs of the actual ministry of Jesus and some of his most significant declarations and demonstrations of his own conception of himself appear in the Magnificat.

Protestant theologians have been fearful of mariolatry. We have also been so convinced of the influence of the early church upon the writing of the New Testament that the actual teaching relationship between Jesus and his mother has been neglected. These have left more of a vacuum than a ready recognition of the mystery that

Mary's relationship to Jesus poses. Our primary knowledge of the educational responsibilities vested in the Jewish home, our knowledge of Jesus' use of the Old Testament Scriptures, and our knowledge of the socio-economic deprivation of both the area and the home in which he grew to maturity all give us reason for concluding that Jesus was instructed by his mother in the prophetic tradition of Judaism. She sang as her own the songs of other mothers of prophets. It is inconceivable that she would not have instructed Jesus to a great extent along the lines of a prophetic interpretation of his calling in God, although to what extent we do not know.

The Old Testament Scriptures. The basis for the instruction of Jesus by both Mary and Joseph was the Old Testament Scriptures. In these sacred writings the motifs for selfhood were arrayed in the minds of devout Jews. The inquiring mind of Jesus himself received a conflict within the very instructions of his mother, namely, the conflict between political and distinctly religious interpretations of the leadership of the life of Israel. Mowinckel, through extensive evidence, has shown that the Messiah expected by the pious Jews of Jesus' day was a political messiah, a human being of David's line. He says that "this is shown both by Jewish literature and the popular conceptions which we find in the Gospels." [1]

Jesus himself probed the meaning of the Scriptures for himself. He is pictured in the Temple story as asking serious questions of the rabbis. The issues of the nature of God's Anointed One may have been settled in the popular mind and hoped for piously in the mind of his mother, but they were open questions in the mind of Jesus. The Holy Spirit led him up in the wilderness in the fullness of his

manhood. The battle that raged there was with the demon himself. The Devil's temptations are almost blueprints of the popular conception of the Messiah as a political saviour who would magically feed hungry people, exercise power over their oppressors, and worship the temporal itself. The answers Jesus gave were from the prophetic revision of the Law, Deuteronomy. The conflict that raged was between the leadership of the Holy Spirit in a spiritual transformation of life and the leadership of the Devil in a political Zionism. Jesus was not confronted as we today are accustomed to think, with what Cullman calls "a single fixed concept of the Messiah" or the Anointed One. Even the political saviour with all his nationalistic characteristics "could hold the most widely varying content. . . ." As Jesus felt the weight of his life on his hands, these conflicting images of selfhood waged war in his very being.[2]

The Devil departed from Jesus only for a season when the decisions were clearly made. We ask, then, who did Jesus decide to be? How can we calculate the outcome of the temptations in the wilderness with any degree of definiteness as to who Jesus thought he was? The ensuing story of his inaugural sermon at Nazareth crucially depicts the focused directions of his selfhood. Let us explore these passages for his definition of his identity. (See Luke 4:14-30.)

At Nazareth, Jesus met his own history frontally. He had been accustomed to going to this synagogue. He returned there. He did not seek to "make a name for himself" as if Nazareth did not exist. He returned to Nazareth, "where he had been brought up." This battle had already been won decisively in his acceptance of his identity as a Nazarene. The abusive sneers of Nathaniel later could not

deter him from encountering lovingly this guileless man. The questions of the Nazarenes as to his parentage: "Is this not Joseph's son?" did not preoccupy Jesus' attention. His main concern was to define clearly the purpose with which he was possessed, the calling that was his. He identified himself clearly in his conversation, his meeting with the people of his home synagogue. One can say "meeting" and "conversation" advisedly, because Jesus was anticipating what was in their minds and articulating their questions as he went.

Jesus cast his decisions as to his identity by the choice of the passage from which he read. He chose Isaiah 61, thereby choosing the prophetic rather than the rabbinical motif for his own selfhood. He chose the "anointing" passage to read. He told them that the Spirit of the Lord had anointed him. Here again, as in the wilderness story, we see the ministry of the Holy Spirit in the life of Jesus as the Incarnate Word. The Holy Spirit had descended upon him at his baptism, and here Jesus articulates the meaning of his mission and message. He had been "anointed." There is no discussion of official "roles"; he does not use a "title." He is remarkably serene in his disregard of the popular expectations of his audience. But the Spirit of the Lord has "anointed" him. This word is the verb of action from which the name "Christ" was later derived, and from which the appellation, "Christian," was developed. Here it means "to have been consecrated." Cullman comments, "Jesus himself always showed a peculiar reserve in accepting" the name Messiah "as a description of his calling and person." [3] Rather, Jesus himself defined his calling with strong verbs of purposive action. He related himself to prophets who had lived according to similar purposes. They did similar

things to those which Jesus himself had been anointed to perform.

These purposive actions were definitive for Jesus' self-hood. The Spirit of the Lord had anointed him "to heal the brokenhearted," "to preach good news to the poor," "to proclaim release to the captives" and "recovering of sight to the blind," "to set at liberty those who are oppressed" and "to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." These define the selfhood of Jesus in terms of the tasks of his life. They do not predispose his ministry with stereotyped notions of an "official" messiah. They affirm the *functions* of the anointed one, but say nothing of the *popular official* of political dimensions. The ministry of healing, concern for the poor, the handicapped, the prisoner, and the procla-mation of the at-handness of the kingdom of God—these were his mission, the focus of his identity. He would know himself and be known by them.

Jesus rejected the tasks of "shattering unrighteous rulers," "purging Jerusalem from nations that trample her down" and "breaking in pieces" with "a rod of iron" their substance. He refused to "have heathen nations to serve him under his yoke." He did not perceive his identity as "making Jerusalem as of old. . . ." These were the contrast-ing functions of the Messiah as described classically in Psalms of Solomon 17:21 ff.[4] When John the Baptist sent two of his disciples asking, "Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?" Jesus answered him: "Go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have good news preached to them" (Luke 7:22). He would be known as the Anointed One by the acts of redemption he

performed, not by the official role-expectations which others required of him. He was to be no functionary; to the contrary he was to work the works of Him that sent him while it was day. He had decided clearly what this work was, how it should be performed, and to what end: to glorify his Father, who always heard him as he prayed.

Jesus, furthermore, clarified his identity to his hometown audience by citing his mentors in the Hebrew heritage. He reminded them of the work and mission of the parents of the prophets: Elijah and Elisha. Elijah performed works of mercy for the widow of Zarephath. Elisha healed Naaman the Syrian. These were ministries of mercy and healing, but more than that. They were ministries to people *outside* the political unity of Jewry to whom the popular Messiah was expected to come. These prophets came to the *foreigner!* What a reversal of stereotyped expectations of the Anointed One! Jesus had defined his identity with courage and clarity: the Anointed One was a healer, a reconciler, and a bearer of good news of the kingdom of God to all those who have despaired, not just Jews.

The early church was vividly aware of this same identity of Jesus after the resurrection. It proclaimed his redemptive love and power to "foreigners" such as Cornelius. Simon Peter perceived that God is "no respecter of persons." He said to Cornelius:

"You know the word which he sent to Israel, preaching good news of peace by Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all), the word which was proclaimed throughout all Judea, beginning from Galilee after the baptism which John preached: how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with

power; how he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him" (Acts 10:36-38).

Jesus' articulate definition of his identity shattered the pre-conceptions of his hearers at Nazareth, interpreted his mission to John the Baptist and transcended the Cross and the Tomb in the resurrected life of the early church.

Jesus and Those Who Misunderstood Him. However, this commitment of Jesus set him at variance against his own home city, against his mother and brothers, and against his own disciples. They misunderstood him most roundly at his refusal to accept the official Messiah-designate of Israel. The rapid succession of events in the first three chapters of Mark shows this increase of mis-understanding in those who were closest to him. The unclean spirit in the diseased man in the synagogue at Capernaum said: "I know who you are, Holy One of God" (Mark 1:23 ff.). Jesus silenced him as he healed the man. He healed Simon's mother-in-law. At evening "he healed many who were sick with various diseases, and cast out many demons; and he would not permit the demons to speak, because they knew him." He healed the leper, and not only healed the paralytic but told him that his sins were forgiven. He healed the man with a withered hand even though it was on the sabbath. Mark tells us that ". . . whenever the unclean spirits beheld him, they fell down before him and cried out, 'You are the Son of God.'" Yet in all these witnesses to "office," Jesus silenced the voices of those who said this.

Rather, he encountered his disciples as one anointed to heal and proclaim good news and who *calls* his disciples. He had defined his own selfhood, unmistakably demon-

strated it, and then called them as his disciples in this ministry. He had steadfastly refused the political role of the popularly expected Messiah and taken upon himself the work of healing, reconciliation, and proclamation of the good news of the Kingdom.

After he had named his disciples "he went home." Here his friends went out to seize him. They said: "He is beside himself." The scribes came down from Jerusalem and accused him of being possessed by Beelzebul. His mother and his brothers came, stood outside, and sent for him. Why they did so is not stated. Did they share his friends' concern and think him "beside himself"? Mystery shrouds their motives. But we know that he declared his own family to be those who "do the will of God." Their misunderstanding of his mission and message became the occasion for a clearer definition of his true selfhood in relation to the family of God his Father.

Jesus' friends and relatives were the first ones to raise questions as to the stability and mental health of Jesus in relation to his identity as the Anointed One. Most recently, Professor John Knox has spoken of "the psychological plausibility of the conception of the Servant-Messiah as a mode of Jesus' own self-consciousness." He asks: "Could so sane a person have entertained such thoughts about himself?" Then Knox answers his own question: "For myself," Knox says, "I find it exceedingly difficult to answer affirmatively." He says further: "A sane person, not to say a good person, just could not think of himself in such a way." [5] Knox just does not believe that Jesus' conscious acceptance of a Messianic self-concept could have been compatible with the mental health of the man Jesus. It would have deprived him of the normal self-consciousness

of a man, thereby undercutting the true humanity of Christ.

Let us carefully consider this, however. We have seen that the title "messiah" had many meanings rather than one meaning. The Synoptic accounts portray Jesus as rejecting the political and national role of Messiah as from the Devil himself. They describe him as silencing the unclean spirits who recognized him as the Holy One of God. Even in the crucial days of his trial he does not answer his inquisitors directly nor deny their implications concerning his Messiahship. Cullman summarizes by saying that the three Synoptic accounts are in complete agreement in that "Jesus demonstrates an attitude of extreme restraint toward, if not direct rejection of, the *title* 'Messiah.' " [6] His reason for doing this, thinks Cullman, was his resistance to a "false conception of his task, the conception which he recognized and fought as a satanic temptation." [7]

Wrede and Percy [8] point out that Cullman's interpretation of the motives of Jesus seems to suggest a degree of strategic expediency in Jesus' reserve concerning the title, Messiah. A more consistent view, it seems, would be that Jesus was solely and wholly concerned about the healing and forgiveness of men, as such, and not concerned at all about "appointment" to some "office" which was "cluttered" with the idolatries of the ages before him. He was purely and completely focused upon the accomplishment of the calling for which he had been anointed—healing the brokenhearted, preaching to the poor, proclaiming release to the captives, recovering of sight to the blind, and setting free those who were oppressed. He chose to be known by his discipline in prayer and works in faith, not

by man-perceived roles and expectations. On the other hand, the people who were closest to him misunderstood this. The very act of ignoring their stereotyped thinking about the Messiah was interpreted *by them* as his "being beside himself." They thought him mentally ill because he did *not* accept quickly the role of Messiah; Knox today thinks he would have been mentally ill if he had!

Jesus and His Enemies. The selfhood of Jesus was most crucially defined in his conflict with his enemies. They accused him of being in league with the demons because he had power over them. They saw his acts of healing compassion as violations of the days on which they were performed. His relationship to the multitudes was a threat to their own messianic strivings. For, as we have seen, the Jewish messianic expectations were not that he would be a divine-human person, but that he would be a human being, *per se*. They did not associate the messiah with repentance, the heart of the preaching that cost John the Baptist his head. They considered it blasphemy that Jesus should bring the good news of the forgiveness of sins to men. They were threatened indeed by the authenticity with which he spoke. Rather, they saw him as their political redeemer. Even their concept of the Son of Man was rooted more in Daniel's prophecy of one coming on the clouds of heaven than in the Servant image found in Isaiah 53. Therefore, Jesus was the epitome of the selfhood which they rejected. Their hostility mounted and culminated in the plans that killed him on the charge that he claimed to be everything that he had dedicated his life to refusing to be: the King of the Jews.

Then the vocation of the cross became the focal center of Jesus' identity, the very selfhood for which he had come

into the world. Thereby Jesus transformed the idea of the Anointed One in an "essential and decisive way," says Mowinckel.[9] This could not have come to Jesus, he says, from the idea of the Son of Man current in his day. Rather, "through adversity and suffering God had to show him that it was so." [10] This unheard-of vocation of the Anointed One, to be humiliated, suffer, and die, transformed and lifted up the whole mission and message of Jesus to a hitherto unrevealed plane. The mission of healing and forgiveness would be communicated now through his sacrificial death, not just his acts of healing and kindness. Healing and forgiveness would be thus made available to all men and he in turn would become the mediator between men and God. This was his calling.

The crux of the matter is that Jesus was no "status seeker" in any sense of the word. His divine humility took these opportunities for "officeholding" as temptations in and of themselves, "and he emptied himself" of these human appellations as surely as he "did not count equality with God as a thing to be grasped." Being anointed by the Spirit of the Lord meant to him to take upon himself the very form of the humblest of men, the poor, sick, and brokenhearted and not the power-symbols of men. *Being* the Messiah was a very different thing from either *being called* the Messiah or *naming oneself* the Messiah. Yet men encountered him, saw his mighty works, perceived that God had anointed him with the Holy Spirit and power, and saw how he was "put to death by hanging on a tree" and was raised by God who made him manifest. They themselves bore witness that he who had refused to be known as the Messiah, in deed and truth was the Messiah and

they themselves had been called to bear witness to the forgiveness of sins through him (Acts 10: 42-43).

Jesus himself carried his penetration of the human situation to the nadir of existence in the death of the cross. The disciples who tempted him with the sounding brass and tinkling cymbals of the political Messiahship now could say: "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified" (Acts 2:36). That identity which was his from the foundation of the world was now the selfhood which he in fact by his death, birth, and resurrection he had now become: the Christ.

Encounter with Christ and the Christian Calling

The purposes of God in Christ are fulfilled in his encounter with man as the Living Christ who again focuses man's identity in what W. O. Carver has called "the glory of the Christian calling." Christ asks the man who is filled with the gratitude that forgiveness brings him: *"Quo vadis?"* Whither goest thou? Forgiveness and healing at their depth prompted persons in the New Testament to bear witness to the one who has restored them to selfhood and sanity. The disciples after the resurrection felt themselves to be "chosen as witnesses" of the event of his resurrection.

The identity of man is diffused and distorted, not only by the threat of condemnation which is overcome by the power of forgiveness, but also by the threat of meaninglessness which can be overcome only by the power of a true sense of calling. Jesus dared not to accept the idolatrous conceptions of his message and mission in the world. The defections and desertions of the disciples were built

on these empire-building quests, not for selfhood, but for power. The tragedy of Judas stands as a symbol—within the inner circle of followers—of those who, upon having met Jesus Christ, wrongly focus his meaning for their lives around their own projected desires rather than the task of life to which he himself anoints them. The earthly messianisms are "no exit" situations of meaninglessness. They are "encounters with nothingness," the worship of the elemental spirits of the universe which by their very nature are no-gods. The collapse of such falsely centered selfhood results in madness, not a clearly defined sense of mission. The illness itself becomes the counterfeit substitute for authentic selfhood. Judas' suicide, far from being a moral judgment from conventional morality, was, as suicide is today, a "final index to man's predicament; . . . the boundary line beyond which man cannot go." [11]

Encounter with Jesus Christ confronts us with a choice between futility and articulate meaning as the heart of the selfhood that we become. Yet this encounter itself brings to the surface fresh dimensions of conflict in the drawing of the issues for decision. These conflicts must be clarified, and specific choices made in the focusing of man's identity in encounter with Christ. They are the conflicts between hiddenness and openness, between detachedness and communion, and between role playing and self-vulnerability. Each of these conflicts is met and resolved for better or for worse in the encounter with Christ. Each one needs careful explanation here.

Hiddenness and Openness. The encounter with Jesus Christ as the Anointed One challenges the cryptic elements in our motivations. Meeting him in forgiveness has enabled us to face with courage the threat of our condemning

histories of sin. We have been empowered through faith to accept our history and our heritage as our own and the threat of dissociating ourselves from our real identity has been transcended in the encounter with the Love known as Christ. Yet our mission and ministry cannot be defined until we are enabled to renounce subtlety and human canniness as the motive for our relationships to people. This renunciation Ananias and Sapphira could not make. They wanted the status of being related to the Christian communion without the openness and candor which it required. They "held back part," not only of their proceeds from the land they sold, but also of themselves. They had it in their hearts to lie to the Holy Spirit. Here again the truth of God had been exchanged for a lie, and the worship of the Creator had been exchanged for the worship of the creature. The end result was not selfhood, but self-destructiveness.

And we all, with unveiled face, beholding the glory of the Lord, are being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord who is the Spirit. . . . We have renounced disgraceful, underhanded ways; we refuse to practice cunning or to tamper with God's word, but by the open statement of the truth we would commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God (II Corinthians 3:18; 4:2).

The person who commits himself to the use of "hidden persuaders" in the accomplishment of his purposes in life thereby creates a sham center for his own selfhood. This sham center is collapsible. The processes of time have within themselves that which will precipitate the collapse.

Tennessee Williams, in the introduction to his play, "Rose Tattoo," says that even though we may not be willing to admit it, "we are all haunted by a truly awful sense of impermanence." He describes a New York cocktail party in which the sense of impermanence of things hangs in the air. "Horror of insincerity, of *not meaning*, overhangs these affairs like the cloud of cigarette smoke and the hectic chatter. This horror is the only thing, almost, that is left unsaid." [12] This horror of insincerity has distinctly religious connotations for the renunciation required of Christian selfhood. Jesus confronted Nathaniel (John 1:45 ff.), who, even though he spoke in dark negativities about Jesus' heritage as a Nazarene, was accepted as a man in whom there was no guile. He had already moved near the Kingdom in his candor and openness.

The deepest sort of candor is required in the true focus of selfhood in Christ. Candor with oneself calls for confrontation of subtle forms of self-deception. Even speaking the truth with others may be a form of illness and false centering of self without genuine internal candor. The truth spoken in love is the truth first spoken to the self. The truth filtered through personal renunciation of the need to hurt rather than to heal is the truth that edifies. Only the truth that edifies is the truth. The renunciation of the immaturities of craftiness and deceitfulness issues in the kind of growth that is, as Augustine says, "toward God" in Christ. If we can decisively renounce the way of hiddenness in behalf of the openness of encounter with Christ, then one of the main sources of meaninglessness and emptiness has been dealt with. We need, as the Apostle Paul says, "no longer live in the futility of our minds." We are pseudo-selves until we renounce what Anne Morrow

Lindbergh has called the most fatiguing thing in the world: sham. Thorleif Boman declares that "the universe as God's creation possesses an inner unity and is tuned to a definite pitch, and the pitch is goodness." [13] The inner unity of selfhood remains dispersed and its pitch off-key apart from a decisive renunciation of hiddenness in behalf of the openness required for encounter with Christ. Then a person is open to the calling of Jesus Christ.

Detachedness and Communion. Harry Stack Sullivan describes the identity of a kind of person that might be called a *detached* self. He says that this person lives "through a great number of fugitive, fleeting involvements with other people." Such detached selves verbalize well and do not lack fluency of speech. Sullivan says: "They almost always say the right thing. They often say it well, but it *signifies* very little." [14] He says that these persons are unable to profit from experience and have a genuine disregard for the future. They do not establish, much less maintain, durable relationships with other people. At the core of their being is the same meaninglessness of which we have been speaking in this encounter with Christ at the point of the definition of life purposes. This person keeps himself detached and lives a life of pleasant distance from commitment to anyone. He is like the Rich Young Man who encountered Christ and asked scintillating questions but went away sorrowing, uncommitted, unrelated, and detached. Whatever selfhood such a person develops remains, as Sullivan expresses it, "relatively vestigial." He never focuses durably on any one or any thing, to say nothing of forming a covenant of lasting trust in relation to the Lord Jesus Christ.

The "vestigial self" of which Sullivan speaks exists to a

certain degree in every man. There is a vital difference between the need for solitude and privacy and the will to remain uncommitted to a covenant relationship with anyone, of whom Christ is the most crucially central person. The making of a covenant with Christ implies an interpenetration of selves. Christ, in the covenant of his blood, allowed himself to be penetrated in the completeness of his vulnerability and commitment on the Cross. He as the risen Christ stands at the door and knocks and if any man will hear his voice and open the door and let him in, he will come in and sup with him and he with Christ (Revelation 3:20). This is the selfsame thing that Zacchaeus, in contrast to the Rich Young Man, did. He opened himself and his house to abiding communion with Christ. He found a new center of selfhood and fresh calling in Christ. He announced his decisions which had to do with his renunciation of craftiness and dishonesty and his having been anointed to minister to the poor. This is the same kind of penetration of being which took place with the Apostle Peter in his vision which led him to Cornelius. His closedness and detachedness from Cornelius was in the name of his ancestral religion. But in the deeper-level revelations of the world-wide mission of the Christ, he related himself to the Gentile, Cornelius. In his commitment to Christ, he discovered his true selfhood in the enlargement of his communion to include those who were not Jews.

This is the heart of the missionary outreach of the Christian gospel today. The individual or group who refuses to be penetrated by or to accept responsibility for initiating durable relationships with persons different from themselves is a detached self or group. This refusal often

appears in the name of Christ. The detached, isolated, self-contained persons, however, as Sullivan again says, move "through life giving many of the appearances of human beings; they just miss being human. . . ." [15] But the genuine focusing of selfhood in Christ comes as one forms his new family of the people of all nations "who do the will of God." This is the purpose of all true religion in the development of the self, says Sigmund Freud: it lowers the importance of the earthly family and gives the instinctual impulses of the self a safe mooring place as he gains access and communion to the larger family of mankind.

Commitment lies at the center of communion with God and with other people. The detached person avoids commitment. However, there is no true selfhood without commitment, for one's defined identity is the composite of his covenantal relationships. Therefore Christ's encounter with us is decisive at the point of our commitments. The very nature of commitment is the intentional assignment of meaning of life and experience. The calling of Christ "sets" the direction to our identity and in doing so focuses life in true selfhood. Andras Angyal describes the rigid personality which has such a fixed "set" of personality that all flexibility is lost, and on the other side of the continuum he speaks of the "flighty, inconstant, loosely organized type of personality which is not able to maintain a given set for a sufficient length of time." [16] The commitment of self in the calling of Christ as portrayed in the New Testament moves the self dynamically from one level of freedom to another and at the same time maintains a consistency of direction that gives continuity and serenity to the self.

Role-Worship and Self-Vulnerability. A third dimension

of selfhood emerges as the issues of man's vocation are focused even further in encounter with Christ. We have seen how Jesus himself took issue with and decisively rejected the popular role expectations of his day. He said of his generation: "To what shall I compare this generation? It is like children sitting in the market places and calling to their playmates,

> "We piped to you, and you did not dance;
> we wailed, and you did not weep" (Luke 7:32b).

He rejected therefore the dictates of the crowd to make him play at life, to enact a role, to assume a part, to wear a mask. This gathered up both his rejection of hiddenness in behalf of openness and his rejection of detachment in behalf of complete participation in and communion with the humblest of suffering men.

Roles in life as "parts" played and offices filled serve both to detach one from people and at the same time to imprison one in the symbolism of the role itself. Worship of the role allows one to act only in ways assigned to that particular "part" which he is supposed to "play." Before long, he is using his energy defending, enacting, and enhancing this "role" as this, that, or the other "personage." The real self is never defined at all, much less given first place in one's relationships with God and his fellow man. Jesus refused to allow men or evil spirits to force him into any preconceived set of stereotypes. Rather, the ministries of healing, release, and proclamation *were* his anointed tasks.

However, in his wholehearted commitment as one who heals and brings the good news of the forgiveness of sins

to men, he earned a role of his own. This in itself became a burden to him, one that drew so many people to him that he had to escape the prison of the crowd. This in itself became his "life" which he had "taken up" and which he ultimately felt called to "lay down" of his own accord. The decision to lay down his life was the decision of the Cross. He chose to make himself completely vulnerable to the encounter with mankind, even vulnerable at the point of his very life itself.

This choice between "role-worship" and "self-vulnerability," as we have designated it, is a definitive problem of selfhood in the Christian calling. Contemporary man defines his selfhood largely in terms of his social roles. He focuses his identity in his work. He is a doctor, a lawyer, a minister, a businessman, a farmer, or, as many say, "*just* a working man" or "*just* a housewife." It is more than accidental, one can assume, that many family names of persons are drawn from the kind of work their ancestors have done. Jesus was a carpenter. We are "millers" or "smiths," or "tailors," for example. These working roles become self-consuming to the point that one is little other than what his work is. The contemporary discussions of co-operation between the helping professions, for instance, are mostly devoted to dealing with the role-problems of the professionals as they meet each other in these "parts" they play. This can become, and often does become, an idolatrous worship of roles rather than the peeling away of the roles to an intensely human encounter between the very selves of the persons as persons. More poignantly than this, these forms of role-worship insulate us from real understanding of the crucial sufferings of the persons to whom we are called to minister. We are neither vulnerable as selves in

relation to each other nor as whole persons in encounter with the forces of disaster at work in the needy person.

The husband and wife correspondingly are preoccupied with "playing a role" as men and women to such an extent they never really meet each other as fellow human beings who need each other. Social expectations which have been handed from one generation to the next burden them down with what they think their partner expects of them. Added to the expectations each has of himself, these hidden assumptions make communication and self-revealing next to impossible. These roles become the "sham-centers" around which dishonest relationships begin to form. They become the intolerable burdens from which one must retreat into fantasy or clandestine relationships, and from which one must flee into hyperactivity of work or outright antisocial behavior. These conflicts are especially acute in the lives of professional persons where the vocational roles are so fixed and rigid, such as with doctors, ministers, and teachers. Probably the most vivid example of the conflict is in the lives of actors and actresses themselves, persons who by profession play "parts" and "roles" until it is very difficult to tell *who* they *really* are. The husband and wife genuinely become "one flesh" when, in something more than just a sexual encounter, they are enabled by the love of Christ to be made themselves vulnerable enough to each other that they can penetrate beyond the façades of the roles they play. They become selves with marriage as a calling and not just a game when they do this.

Parents and children similarly play roles with each other. Parents often treat their children against their own better wisdom. They feel that they must do as their parents did, as their neighbors now do, or as the most recent

manual on parent-child relationships says they should. Children can be encouraged to explore the personal history and the deeper sense of mission of the parent. They can participate in the very selfhood of the parent in terms of knowing their commitments and covenants with God and other people. For example, Harper Lee tells the story of a lawyer in a Deep South town. He was assigned the defense of a Negro man by the judge of the court. He took the case and gave it his fullest possible devotion, not because he wanted to prove that he was a good lawyer, but, as his daughter quoted him as saying, "I could not face my children otherwise, and I hope they come to me for their answers about this rather than listen to the whole town." [17] Here was a man who broke through the expected roles of society and ministered directly to a Negro man on trial for his life. He broke through the wall of role-idolatry in relation to his children and chose to communicate with them as a genuinely human person and not just as a person who was supposed by his community to behave a certain way as a father. He could not do this without a clear sense of selfhood focused upon a consciously chosen mission in life.

The burden of this discussion is that Jesus' Incarnation was decisively *more* human than the socially accepted roles of life will allow us to have the courage to be. Hence his was the authentic selfhood and ours the counterfeit one by reason of our avid greed for the affluence and protection from others afforded by the roles we both seek and fill. Thus God, Albert Camus says, does not need to create guilt and punishment. We and our fellow men do so with what Samuel Southard has called the "tyranny of expectations," the idolatry of roles. Thus, according to Camus, we

live our "whole lives under a double code, and [our] most
serious acts [are] often the ones in which we are least in-
volved." [18] Jesus actualized his selfhood of his encounter
with God in prayer and with man in conflict, suffering,
and tragedy by drawing out the authentic mission for
which he lived and died and was raised from the dead.
He made himself fully vulnerable to the power of men to
disillusion and hurt him and, at the same time, gave him-
self to them in unconditional love.

The contemporary individual spends the early years of
his life preparing for a specific kind of work. He uses much
of his energies in the first years of his life as a worker de-
fining and activating what his vocational role is. He sin-
cerely and rightly throws his whole being into the art and
craft of his trade and becomes such a person indeed with
a moderate degree, an exceptionally high or low degree of
success. This is who he is, the self he has become. He has
"arrived," is "arriving," or is about to "arrive" in his chosen
work. Then meaninglessness overtakes him and he begins
to ask what life is all about and who he really is, anyhow.
He has achieved a working role in life, but now is faced
with two choices for "laying down" his role.

First, he can "ditch" his responsibilities through some
more or less unconscious, compulsive set of symptoms.
We meet and read of persons who do this. An exception-
ally successful business man is caught in a system of fraud-
ulent deals. An outstanding physician begins a series of
public attacks on his colleagues. A minister with an im-
peccable record becomes involved in an extramarital sex-
ual episode which results in divorce. More often, the
symptoms are much more respectable ones of a somatic
disorder which, however, ease the pressure and redefine

the role of the person away from the complexities of his official functions. Albert Camus tells of such a person in his short story, "The Artist at Work." As the community "artist" he became so successful that he could not function as an artist for fulfilling the role and expectations of people who cast him in their stereotype of what an artist ought to be.[19] The story ends with the man in complete physical exhaustion after having hidden in the attic for weeks in order to finish one painting which consisted of nothing but the word: "*solitary* or *solidary*." It was uncertain which it was. The power of roles-for-roles'-sake to destroy their idolaters cannot be overestimated.

But, on the other hand, an alternative to such futility exists. One can lay down his role as a means to power. He can dedicate himself to healing the brokenhearted, bringing good news to the poor, releasing the captive, bringing sight to the blind, setting at liberty the oppressed, and proclaiming the acceptable year of the Lord. He courageously confronts the powers of evil where they are most active. Strangely enough, the medical profession itself has offered us brilliant examples of this in Schweitzer, Grenfell, and more recently Tom Dooley. The Christian ministry periodically produces a Francis of Assisi, a Dietrich Bonhoeffer, or an Anton Boisen. The occasions in which the beady-eyed professionalism of both medicine and the ministry evoke this kind of "laying down" of roles are painfully few. The fate of idealism in both professions is badly in need of research. On the other hand, we need even more the kind of research that would analyze and describe the use of symptoms and antisocial behavior as means of getting out from under the heavy armor of the social roles of all our great professions.

However, a beatnik generation can point to innumerable folk who have rebelled against or laid down the great roles and social conformities of our day. Simply committing oneself to humanitarian service may be done with no clear definition of selfhood other than the good feeling one receives from the gratitude of others less fortunate. Laying aside or refusing to take up the roles of the ambitious and successful must spring from a deeper and purer sense of focused identity than this. The longer-range intentions of meaningful mission in life do not really become apparent until we focus man's identity in encounter with Christ in the focal event in Christ's own selfhood: the Resurrection. In this the Christian's ultimate destiny and abiding selfhood are decisively determined.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER THREE

1. Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954), p. 286.
2. Oscar Cullman, *The Christology of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), p. 111.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 113.
4. Translated by G. B. Gray in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, R. H. Charles, ed., Vol. II, 1913.
5. John Knox, *The Death of Jesus* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957), p. 54.
6. Cullman, *op. cit.*, p. 125.
7. *Ibid.*
8. Quoted in Cullman, *op. cit.*
9. Sigmund Mowinckel, *op. cit.*, p. 449.
10. *Ibid.*
11. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), Vol. II, p. 75.
12. Tennessee Williams, *Rose Tattoo* (New York: New Directions, 1950), p. viii.

13. Thorleif Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), p. 100.
14. Harry Stack Sullivan, *Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry* (Washington, D. C.: The William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation, 1947), p. 38.
15. Sullivan, *op. cit.*, p. 38.
16. Andras Angyal, *Foundations for a Science of Personality* (New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1941), p. 139.
17. Harper Lee, *To Kill a Mockingbird* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1960), p. 97.
18. Albert Camus, *The Fall* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1956), pp. 110, 88-89.
19. Albert Camus, *Exile and the Kingdom* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1958), pp. 110-158.

His Resurrection and Our Destiny

> I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me (Galatians 2:20).

> I protest, brethren, by my pride in you which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die every day! (I Corinthians 15:32).

> Sin pays its servants; the wage is death. But God gives to those who serve him: His free gift is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord (The Phillips Translation of Romans 6:23).

Everything that has been said thus far presupposes the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. It could not have been written were it not for the fact that Jesus Christ is risen from the dead. The decisive factor in selfhood is encounter with Christ, but this is encounter with a Living Lord of the present and not merely the study of the extant records of a dead hero. The Incarnate Christ could have brought forgiveness to men in "the days of his flesh." But apart from his having conquered death and been raised from the dead such an encounter of forgiving love would be second-

hand to the very next generation and lost to us. All that has been said here is "after the fact" of the Resurrection. Resident in the reality of the Resurrection is the abiding power and creativity whereby the Christian calling becomes a compelling intention and not just a passive assent to the proposition that Jesus was the Messiah. The Resurrection of Christ generates the power whereby the identity of man is focused in the relationship of faithful trust and inseparable communion which we know as Christian selfhood.

Meanings of the Resurrection for Selfhood

The primary concern here is for the significance of the Resurrection for the destiny of selfhood. One good way to arrive at this relevance is to explore the meaning of the Resurrection for the selfhood of first-century Christians. Also some of the contemporary interpretations of the Resurrection offer real assistance in the clarification of Christian selfhood. In this way we take into consideration the varieties of religious experience which have arrived at different understandings of the resurrection.

The Apostolic Witness. The apostles were transformed by the event of the resurrection of Jesus. After his crucifixion they were in utter despair. As Emil Brunner says, the disciples were left in "a state of indescribable sadness and disillusionment." [1] The very focus of their identity had been destroyed. They did not know who they were nor where they were going. They scattered in a fearful loss of integrity and hope. They had encountered Jesus and laid down everything to follow him. He was their leader and protagonist. Now all the careful instructions he had given them about the shape of things to come were out of reach

of their power to comprehend. They were in a condition of shock, apathy, and despair at having been estranged and separated by the humiliating death of their leader. They were desolate, orphaned, and alone. They retreated to the elemental skill they had known from boyhood: fishing. Disillusionment and grief took the place of any clear focus of identity in them. These emotions could well have become the organizing center of a selfhood built on the negativities of defeat, saturated with hostility and cynicism.

But the mighty action of God in raising Jesus from the dead overcame this grief and disillusionment with the Living Presence of the Risen Christ. This was what Paul Tillich has called the "conquest of transitoriness." As Tillich further says, "death was not able to push Jesus into the Past." [2] The whole identity of the disciples took on an eternal dimension that transcends the fear of death and one of communion that overwhelms the power of death to separate. Their selfhood was centered in Jesus Christ who now was "the same yesterday, today, and forever." Their grief was transcended by fellowship with Christ and their disillusionment was replaced by hope.

The Risen Lord became the living Mediator between the disciples and their history of sin and heritage of law. He opened their eyes to the meaning of the Scripture and brought all the power of his Being in God to the meaning of their lives. The proclamation of the Resurrection became their calling. They rediscovered the forgiveness of Christ in his all-inclusive love, even though they had fled when he was tried and crucified. They reactivated their calling in his commissioning of them as "witnesses to his resurrection." They re-established their relationship to

each other. They enrolled Matthias to become "with them a witness to the resurrection" to fill Judas' place. The Christian church was born under the earthly ministry of Jesus, but it was reborn in the power of the resurrected Christ. John Knox asserts, "The primitive Christian community was not a memorial society with its eyes fastened on a departed master; it was a dynamic community created around a living and present Lord." [3]

Furthermore, these disciples attributed their ministry of healing and proclamation to the poor entirely to the power of the Resurrection. Their pastoral care was not merely humanitarian kindness. The rulers of the temple recognized them as men who had associated with Jesus. The disciples confessed as much and reminded the rulers that they had crucified Jesus, and that God had raised him from the dead. The rulers asked them: "By what power or by what name did you do this?" (referring to the healing of the crippled man). The disciples answered: ". . . by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead, by him this man is standing before you well" (Acts 4:5-10). In other words, their pastoral care was not based upon healing for healing's sake, upon a technique or skill, or even upon their own feeling of security as "therapists," however important these may be in our present-day values. Rather, they were motivated by a singlehearted conviction of the fact and power of the Resurrection.

A crucial problem arises as to whether or not this experience of the Resurrection was not a subjective grief reaction of those who knew Jesus best and were bereaved for him. The extensive and fascinating research on the processes of grief now in the literature would make this an

enchanting conclusion to draw *but for one hard historical event: the conversion of the Apostle Paul.*

The Pauline Witness. Paul may have known Jesus prior to his death, but most of his knowledge of Jesus was "delivered unto him" by others. Even so, he had been an enemy of the church, regardless of how much or little of Jesus he knew before the crucifixion. He was not his close friend. There was no grief here. He "persecuted and laid waste to the church," instead. He encountered the Living Christ while on a mission of persecution of the church. This encounter became the center of his existence and provided him with the reborn selfhood *in Christ,* as he most characteristically described it. W. D. Davies has said that the formula most frequently used in Paul's teaching "to describe the nature of the Christian man was that he was 'in Christ.'" The Resurrection was no longer a happening reserved for the after-life alone, for which one must await death. Paul now believed, as Davies believes, "that the Age to Come eternally existent in the heavens had already appeared in its initial stages in the Resurrection of Jesus. Already the resurrection body, the body of the final Age to Come, was being formed. Paul had died and risen with Christ and was already being transformed. At death, therefore, despite the decay of his outward body, Paul would already be possessed of another 'body.' The heavenly body was already his." [4]

The Resurrection of Christ, therefore, was more than a belief of the Apostle Paul. It was more than an affirmation of inherent immortality in the Platonic sense. The Resurrection was a present datum of experience whereby Paul himself had been crucified with Christ. Nevertheless, he was alive. Even though he died daily, he was always being

renewed by the power of the Son of God who loved him and gave himself for him. Nothing could separate him from the Christ who had brought him again from his own death in trespasses and sin. His death to sin had been met by the forgiveness of Christ. He had been buried by baptism into Christ's death. Just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so Paul now walked in the newness of life. His very selfhood was reborn in the Resurrection.

Not only was Paul's "conversation in times past," when he persecuted the church and laid waste to Christians, changed in focus by the new life in Christ, but his whole sense of mission was transformed from that of an official role bearer in Judaism to that of a witness to the Resurrection. The Living Christ broke through the hostility of Saul of Tarsus and transformed him into Paul, the evangel of the Resurrection. The Resurrection was his point of departure as he bore his witness at Athens (Acts 17:18, 31, 32), at Jerusalem (Acts 23:6), and before Felix (Acts 24:15). He dealt with vexing ethical problems of the Thessalonians (I Thessalonians 4:12-16), Corinthians (I Corinthians 6:14; 15:33; II Corinthians 4:14 and 5:1 ff.), Romans (Romans 6:1 ff. and 8:11), and (Phillippians 3:21). These problems of marital fidelity and sexual purity, religious discord in the family, motivation for good morals, dealing with discouragement, despair, and spiritual pride, presuming upon the grace of God, the mutilation of the flesh—all were dealt with in terms of the inner meaning of the Resurrection for the destiny of man. They were met with the promise of the freedom of Christ from the law of man and access to the power of the Resurrection for those "who had died to sin" and "could no longer live therein."

Paul's mission and message drew its motive, content, and methodology from his encounter with the Resurrected Christ. His pastoral counsel drew its major premise from the Resurrection and a personal experience of those whom he sought to guide.

The Witness of the New Testament Records. The Resurrection of Christ is central and not peripheral to the records of the New Testament. These records bear a common witness to the fact of the Resurrection, to the transformation that took place in the disciples, the Apostle Paul, and in the people of all walks of life who responded with faith to the witness of the Christian community. The old wineskins of Judaism were broken by the new wine of the gospel. Gentiles participated in the fellowship of the Living Christ. The scattered followers of Jesus at his crucifixion were reborn into a fellowship of destiny in the resurrection. Pittenger writes, "On the basis of New Testament evidence we must say that the Christian faith includes at its heart the assertion that Jesus, though he died, is yet alive forevermore; and that he is alive, not in some vague sense of survival of the soul after death, but in the fullest and richest sense possible—namely, in the whole integrity of his human nature as well as in the divinity which is his by virtue of the intimate and 'personal' relationship of that human nature with God. . . . His spirit and his life, his very self, are regnant at the centre of all things." [5]

The New Testament witnesses to a *bodily* resurrection of Jesus. Early Christians did not ask the questions about this miracle which it is impossible for Western minds to keep from asking. Contemporary theologians tend to take these reports in several different ways. Some accept the

stories on the basis of the authority of the Bible, some making them central to their faith and others not doing so. Others take these stories as attempts of the early church to explain the details of the Event of the Resurrection which happened to them in terms that were understandable to their readers of that day. Even other theologians insist that the Apostle Paul's discussion of the Resurrection in I Corinthians 15:12 ff. is the most authentic report of the Resurrection. He does not attempt to remove the mystery of the Resurrection. God gives the kind of body *he* chooses. However, the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body, apart from the biochemical mechanics of the event, directly challenges the attempts of men both ancient and modern to "spiritualize" away the genuine humanity of Jesus and of human beings. The New Testament records of the Resurrection attest to the wholeness, the integrity, the totality of the person of Jesus Christ in the event of his rising from the dead. To these writers it was not the problem of faith and science that it is for the modern skeptical mind. They moved from the premise of the demonstration of the power of the Living God to transcend death. The act of God was complete and not partial. The selfhood of Christ was completed in the Resurrection. The identity which was his from the foundation of the world had been focused eternally on the Resurrection. Triumphant selfhood was his in spite of the Cross.

The Resurrection and Unfaltering Trust

The threat of condemnation is dealt with decisively in the forgiveness freely available to man in the Incarnate and Risen Christ. The threat of meaninglessness is overcome in the calling and commissioning of the self in Christ

the Messiah. The Resurrection, furthermore, overcomes the threat of separation, disillusionment, and corruption of the self in death. The Resurrection focuses our selfhood at the point of its ultimate destiny. The Living Christ both heightens and clarifies our sense of individuality and creates the fellowship of believers which we know as the church. In fact, the church is the empirical, continuing Body of the Living Christ. Thus faith in the resurrected Christ focuses the identity of man in his destiny as an eternal self in Christ. He participates in an abiding fellowship with Christ characterized by great individuality and capable of abiding community with God and one's fellows.

Yet, a decisive act of faith is required of man in the confrontation of the Living Christ. Rudolf Bultmann expresses it thus: "As soon as the observer's standpoint toward the event is taken, it is no longer the event of forgiveness—for that can never be experienced by an observer." [6] The balconylike detachedness of modern skepticism concerning the Resurrection is not materially different from that which Paul confronted in Athens. Emil Brunner puts his finger on the aching difficulty when he says that a living faith-relationship to Christ "does not come from the fact that one believes the report of the apostle without doubt; rather it comes from the fact that one is reconciled to God through Jesus Christ. This reconciliation is not a mere belief but a rebirth, a new life." [7] Apart from the transformation of the personal life through the voluntary decision of "taking up one's cross," of "being crucified with Christ," or "rising with Christ," men are both unconvinced of the reality of the living Christ and unconvincing to those whom they would try to persuade. With this participant faith, one can say with Augustine:

"It is better not to touch with the hand and to touch with faith than to touch with the hand and not touch with faith. It was no great thing to touch Christ with the hand. The Jews touched Him when they seized Him, they touched Him when they bound Him, and they touched Him when they hung Him up." [8]

This kind of act of faith requires of man a new stance of mind. Empirical science gives one kind of certainty. Faith in the Living Christ offers a different quality of assurance at the center of man's selfhood. Faith is like adding a third dimension to one's perspective of his destiny when only two have been used thus far. This calls for a whole change of identity from a two-plane existence of time and space to a three-plane existence of time, space, and eternity. The eternal dimension provides both height and depth, deals with both life and death, both things present and things to come, powers and principalities. The power of the Resurrection has overcome the separation and disillusionment with which any of these can encounter the man in Christ.

Inseparable Trust. The main source of anxiety of the "empirical self," as William James called the observable person, is the threat of separation from the security-giving relationships which nourish the self. The relationship of parent and child by its nature must undergo parturition from the mother, and adult autonomy from both the mother and the father, on the part of the child. The husband-wife relationship, as Jesus observed in answering the Pharisees about the Resurrection, undergoes separation by death if defection and/or divorce have not broken the relationship before death. The bonds which bind men to institutions, such as businesses and schools, are even

more fragile and easily broken than closer family ties. These relationships are usually called "indefinite" ones or covenants which are "for the foreseeable future." When hostility enters a relationship and it settles into aversion or hatred, the Damocles sword of distrust and separation hangs over or falls upon the relationship, and men say: "I have no more use for him." But more poignantly than this, deep relationships of trust and love are clouded by the sense of anxiety that "something might happen" to a bond which is rich with satisfaction. In fact, the self-dynamism, as Sullivan calls the persistent organization of the individual identity, is made up of these relationships. The self is secure or insecure in terms of this anxiety of separation.

The relationship of a person to Christ is a supreme example. The security of the believer is filled with dread of separation apart from the Resurrection life. In fact, two thousand years of history separate man from Christ apart from the Resurrection. But "one of the plainest tokens of the new life is the certainty of the resurrection, the certainty that nothing can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord," says Emil Brunner.[9] This is the answer of Christ to the threat of separation, particularly the threat of death itself. It was Athanasius who said: ". . . he, the incorruptible Son of God, being conjoined with all by a like nature, naturally clothed all with incorruption, by the promise of the resurrection. For the actual corruption in death is no longer holding ground against men, by reason of the Word, which by his one body has come to dwell among them."[10]

Certain psychologists of selfhood have recently begun to pay increasing attention to the shaping power of the fact of death, and the grasp of the ultimate meaning of

life in the face of death, upon the selfhood of men. Allport cites the example of Amundsen's courageous exploration of the North Pole regions, a goal of his life which he had held since boyhood. In the face of death itself Amundsen's life transcended itself in the larger goals which possessed him.[11] Hermann Feifel has led the research efforts of an interdisciplinary team of scientists on the meaning of death as related to life and selfhood. He says that "in gaining an awareness of death, we sharpen and intensify our awareness of life." He agrees with Augustine "that it is only in the facing of death that man's self is born." [12] Remarkably enough the research volume includes a stage-to-stage developmental study of changing attitudes toward death among selected childhood, adolescent, and adult groups. Biological determinism is rejected by Feifel and others of his associates, for, as he says, "we are mistaken to consider death as a purely biologic event." [13]

But the focus of the work done seems to be on human courage in the face of death and upon the meaning of the phenomenon of death itself. The courage of the Stoic and the inescapability of death, with a few notable exceptions, tend to be the underlying philosophical themes. The research needs to be continued, as Feifel urges. An interesting kind of continuation would be the use of interviews, questionnaires, semantic differential tests, and attitudinal explorations to determine just what the Resurrection does mean to the lives of a given number of persons. Where have they gotten these meanings? What kinds of images does the Easter message of hope in the Resurrection precipitate in the minds of a given fellowship of Christians? From a pastoral research point of view, what kinds of expectations do people bring with them as to the kind of

funeral service they want for a loved one? How do the different age groups in a church school differ in their associations on a carefully told story of the Resurrection? These kinds of research need to be done.

Two comparisons can be made between this research on the meaning of death and the New Testament itself concerning death and resurrection. Both agree in the emphasis upon the clear-cut, unmistakable certainty and reality of death. It is not a sleep nor a dream. Death is death and nothing else. But, on the other hand, the research emphasizes man's courage in the face of death; whereas, without leaving this out, the New Testament offers the answer to man's courage in fellowship with the Living Christ. Man is not left to face death with the lonely, solitary gestures of courage alone. As in the case of Stephen, the very presence of the Living Christ is the secret of a man's courage. As Paul put it, "What do I gain if, humanly speaking, I fought with beasts at Ephesus? If the dead are not raised, 'Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die'" (I Corinthians 15:32). Faith in the living Christ puts the locus of man's courage outside himself in the objective power of Christ in the Resurrection. Thus man can admit that he *is* afraid. He does not have to depend alone upon his rawly mustered courage. Separation from the present forms of human existence in relation to one's family, friends, and loved ones is a grief. To grieve is not unchristian, nor a denial of one's faith in Christ. Rather, to grieve recognizes the incompleteness of human relationships. Honest grief opens the way for the healing which He who is the Resurrection and the Life has to offer. Thus the fear, the separation, and the grief are not faced alone but *with* and *in* Christ from whom neither death nor life

can separate the grieving person. Only idolatry of the human being for whom one is bereaved can hinder this fellowship.

The Renewal of the Disillusioned Self. More difficult to bear than separation and death, however, is the threat which disillusionment and disappointment pose for the true focus of the identity in Christian selfhood. The person, for instance, who was born into the lower-lower class may be filled with both loneliness and loathing for the chaos, filth, and unleashed passions of his early surroundings. The person from the respectable middle classes may feel disdain, cynicism, and hypocritical legalism of his parents and home town. The person in the upper classes may feel trapped and enslaved by the family fortune, and bound and compelled to a minor position in the family business until his parents retire or die. He may be caught in a red-tooth-and-claw struggle with his brothers and sisters for the lion's share of the inheritance. A divorced person, furthermore, may be shattered as a self by the disillusionment of his or her broken marriage.

Organized Christianity itself, divested as it too often is of participation in the power of the Resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, can itself become the stage on which death-dealing competitive conflicts are re-enacted and made more vicious. The emotional deprivation of the poorer classes can turn into the emotional orgies of sectarianism. The tight respectabilities of the middle classes can become the legalistic struggle for status and place among people who are activistically trying to prove themselves worthy of acceptance. Family religion of the upper classes may become ways of perpetuating the "name" of the family beyond the ability of the family itself to do so.

Theological "conservatism" among pastors and theological professors and students *can* be just another name for a deification of clan and cultural customs. Theological "liberalism" on the other hand *can* be just another trick for social climbing without one's admitting it. The conflict between conservatives and liberals often has little relevance to faith itself. Within the circularity of the bondage of family, class, and institution, the forces of sin and death work their separating power even among vested interests in the churches.

This is what Dostoyevsky aptly calls the "breath of corruption." [14] A Russian Orthodox myth had it that the genuinely successful saint was free of the "breath of corruption" in death, in other words, his corpse did not smell. But when the most accepted saint of all, Father Zossima, died, fate would have it that his body reeked of the breath of corruption. This was a scandal in the monastery, because no such thing had ever happened before. But this odor of a decaying body, according to the perceptively woven story of Dostoyevsky, was not the real "breath of corruption." This came in the "frivolity, absurdity, and malice" which it brought out into the open "beside the coffin of Father Zossima." The antipathy of the monks to the whole institution of ruling elders; the actual jealousy other monks felt toward Father Zossima in life; the "intense, insatiable hatred" of Father Zossima by others; the collapsing idolatry that his admirers revealed. As Dostoyevsky puts it, "As soon as signs of decomposition had begun to appear, the whole aspect of the monks betrayed their secret motives. . . . Some . . . shook their heads mournfully, but others did not even care to conceal their delight, which gleamed so unmistakably in their malignant

eyes. And now no one reproached them for it, no one raised his voice in protest." [15]

The cynicism with which the spiritual pilgrimage of the chronically pious and impious alike are beset is a form of living death in itself. Cynicism becomes an idolatrous construction around a center of hopelessness. This hopelessness is born out of disillusionment with the previous false centers of life. The person adopts as a way of life a sort of "What-good-thing-can-come-out-of-Nazareth?" attitude. He asks this in a rhetorical way because he already has the answer: "Nothing." Lecky says that the cynic originally was one who had rejected all domestic ties.[16]

The word "cynicism" now means an "ignorant and insolent self-righteousness" and originally meant "doggish, churlish, and snappish." This latter meaning comes from the Greek word "dog." But the heart of cynicism is self-sufficiency, the firm conviction that surrender to any external influence is beneath the dignity of man. Paul describes the stance of life when he says: ". . . they measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves with themselves, are not wise."

The cynical irreligious man is surpassed by the cynical religious man. The breath of corruption at Father Zossima's funeral was not the odor of the dead man's body, but the cynicism of the religious men around the coffin. They had devoted themselves to religion as a means of gain, or role-worship. Religion was an opportunity for achieving and maintaining status. This is what Gardner Murphy describes in another context as "self-maintenance mores." Thus people become *means* to maintaining and perpetuating an institution or a "program." These ends

justify any kind of behavior, in the cynic's mind. But total surrender to cynicism comes when we say: "This is the way things are. Nothing will ever change them." A next step comes after commitment to this cynical convergence of life's meaning. We begin to contrive ways of making the best of the situation. We substitute cunning and cleverness for commitment, contrivance and manipulation for wholehearted confrontation in love.

The Resurrection and the Integrity of the Self

Fellowship in the power of the Resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ intensifies the integrity of human selfhood. The corruptible ways of existence are clothed with the incorruptible ways of eternal life. The self is redeemed from the destructiveness and the absurdities of the cycle of life itself. The clefts within the self are faced, and the integrity or dignity of the self as a totality is restored. This comes about through a decisive response of calling and commitment, vocation and dedication, of the self to the Living Christ.

Job vividly describes the sheer attrition of human existence itself on the integrity and dignity of the self of man in its estrangement and alienation from God:

> How long will you torment me,
>   and break me in pieces with words?
>
>   .   .   .   .
>
> And even if it be true that I have erred,
>   and my error remains with myself.
>
>   .   .   .   .
>
> Know then that God has put me in the wrong,
>   and closed his net about me.

Behold, I cry out, "Violence!" But I am
  not answered;
  I call aloud, but there is no justice.
He has walled up my way, so that I cannot pass,
  and he has set darkness upon my paths.
He has stripped from me my glory,
  and taken the crown from my head.
He breaks me down on every side, and I am gone,
  and my hope he has pulled up like a tree.
                              (Job 19:2, 4, 6-10)

Then the live option of faith emerges for Job. God is not just the adversary in the outward superficialities of security and status. He is Vindicator in the durable hope of resurrection. Job, in the same discourse, says to his "pastoral counselors," Bildad the Shuhite in particular:

Why do you, like God, pursue me?
  Why are you not satisfied with my flesh?

Oh that my words were written!
  Oh that they were inscribed in a book!
Oh that with an iron pen and lead
  they were graven in the rock forever!

For I know that my Redeemer lives,
  and at last he will stand upon the earth;
  and after my skin has been thus destroyed,
  then without my flesh I shall see God,
whom I shall see on my side,
  and my eyes shall behold and not another.
                              (Job 19:22-27a)

Job had leaned heavily upon the "domestic righteousness" of prudential ethics and the Torah for his "integ-

rity." He saw himself as "blameless and upright." Yet in the depths of his despair, he saw the accrued results of his achieved selfhood shattered to pieces about him. His dignity had been stripped from him. In true Jewish fashion he had hitherto hoped for the reunion of flesh and spirit in the resurrection; he grounded his hope in having achieved the perfection of obedience to the Torah. Now that was a vain hope. Nevertheless, he dared to believe that even without this reward he would see his Vindicator, the Living Redeemer.

But, in the Christian revelation, things were vastly different, especially for Paul. For Paul, Christ, not the Torah, availed for him in death and assured him of the promise of the total restoration and renewal of a glorified body. So deeply ingrained in his being was the conviction of the integral oneness of body and spirit that the unnatural separation of the body and soul by sin would be overcome in the resurrection. The totality of his being was consecrated "wholly" even as he prayed for the same thing for the Thessalonians: "May the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (I Thessalonians 5:23). The integrity and dignity of selfhood was brought alive through the Resurrection as he responded in calling and commitment.

Again, the Apostle Paul also said, ". . . present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God. Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind. . . ." The transformation comes about through the power of the Resurrection operative upon the total commitment of the self to God. This presentation presupposes God's acceptance of the self with all

its distortions, subterfuges, and defenses as symbols of the lack of integrity in us. Repression has failed. Sublimation is appropriately the childhood and adolescent attempt to temporize for the sake of adulthood. But, for the adult, gradual growth and a deferred hope of an imagined maturity is a vain hope. The time for the full grain is at hand. James I. McCord has said, "Time is no longer on our side. . . . Time once considered messianic and salvific, has now become a problem, a deadline, a judge." Decisive commitment of the total self *as it is* opens the gates of a new life for the adult.[17] This response of commitment of the self in its total integrity cannot be done piecemeal; nor can it be done apart from the hope of the Resurrection. This is what we mean when we say that the presentation of the body to God by man is met by the resurrection of the body by God.

Out of this presentation of the total self in dedication to God comes the true vocation of the self. We need to ask: "Just what is the true vocation of the self?" For the adult, striving for inner renewal and some simplification of life, the answer imperatively affirms itself: *If Christ be risen from the dead, life is simplified in the adoration, worship, and, in the classical meaning of the word, "enjoyment" of his Living Presence.* The Presbyterian catechism says that the chief end of man is to glorify God and to *enjoy* him forever. This does not mean enjoyment in the way we would *use* food for the nourishment of our body. It means to love Christ for his own sake, the sheer joy of being with him, of remembering the difference of those times past when we were separated, alienated, and estranged from him.

For example, the worship of Christ is not a means to

rejecting our heritage and demonstrating our social achievements and self-protesting sophistication. The Jewish Christians rejected as heresy all Marcionisms which would amputate the Old Testament heritage from the Christian witness. They had already rejected the circumcision parties who would demand Jewish ceremonial requirements of Gentiles. Modern Christians who have rejected their sectarian background for some more "churchly" and liturgical tradition could learn much from this narrow ridge which the early Christians walked. Learning to sneer at one's early religious upbringing may be a meaningful part of adolescent rebellion. Adult vocation in the worship of Christ, however, calls for reassessment of the true worths that have come to us from our heritages. The best in the past enlarges the riches of the present worship of Christ. The total presentation of the self in the worship of Christ will not permit us to "use" him for the denigration of our heritage. He will not let us leave our heritage uncommitted to him as a body of death to be dragged along after us. This too must be brought alive for his worship and made obedient to his love.

The service of God in Christ is neither an activism nor a tool nor a "technique" apart from the worship of Christ. We care for the disturbed, the shattered, and the mentally sick. We are not simply trying to improve our own status by hobnobbing with any newer helping profession which may happen to be enjoying a passing burst of prestige. We are always searching for the appearing of the living Jesus Christ in the being of those whom we serve. When we have done anything for them, we did so not just to be appreciated by them. We did it not unto them but unto Christ. When we do anything for them which does not

necessarily please them, we are not thrown off course by their hostility and momentary rejection. We did not do this unto them, either, but unto Christ. The knowledge of Christ in his Resurrection and the service of Christ in his ministry are both acts of worship of him. Little children, growing rebels, stress-ridden adults, mellowed or embittered old persons, integrationists and segregationists, ardent ecumenicists and denominationalists, Jews and Gentiles, Negro and white are all persons for whom Christ died and to whom he also promises a glorified body in the Resurrection.

But the tortuous perversion of the ethical meaning and spiritual power of the Resurrection in Christian history is an historical footnote to the loss of integrity of Christian selfhood. Sometimes this has been called "the lost radiance" of Christianity. Seeberg in a few pointed but carefully documented comments traces the steps through which Christian teaching gradually converted the power of the Resurrection, which is the power of the gospel itself, into a doctrine and then changed its basic meaning. Clement firmly held to the Resurrection of the body.[18] In Justin, the Resurrection was an affirmation of man's immortality.[19]

For Origen, the Resurrection was a continuation of the process of purification through ascetic rejection of the body.[20] In Cyprian the Resurrection became "the expected reward of man's good works." In other words the Christian gospel had been conformed into another Torah of merit.

The twin disaster of this process of distortion was (1) the loss of the distinctly Christian experience of the Resurrection of the total self in the immediate present and (2) the loss of the power of Christian proclamation to bring

about the reconciliation of men with death through the power of the gospel. The unique witness of the Christian eschatology, according to Norman O. Brown, "lies precisely in its rejection of the Platonic hostility to the human body and to 'matter,' its refusal to identify the Platonic path of sublimation with ultimate salvation, and its affirmation that eternal life can only be life in a body. Christian asceticism can carry punishment of the fallen body to heights inconceivable to Plato; but Christian hope is for the redemption of that fallen body." [21] The Christian promise of the Resurrection is that the body is sown perishable, and raised imperishable; sown in dishonor and raised in glory; sown in weakness, and raised in power; sown a physical body, and raised a spiritual body; bearing the image of a heavenly man. (See I Corinthians 15:42 ff.) This is the response of God in Christ to the commitment of man. In this destiny rests his ultimate security, integrity, and dignity as a whole self "in Christ" regardless of the history of his "declassification" by himself and his fellows as a human being.

The Resurrection and the Continuity of the Self

Modern man, caught up in the intense demands of the present moment and the rapidity of change in all those things from which men formerly drew their identity—institutions, social rules, visible results of their personal creativity, and stability of agreed-upon values—experiences a continual denudation of the self. Like Job, the "J.B.'s" of today are "stripped of their glory," their "crowns are taken from their heads," they are "broken down on every side," and their "hope is pulled up like a tree." But the modern "J.B.," to continue Archibald MacLeish's con-

temporary analogy, is different from the Job of the Bible in a vitally important way. He no longer says that *God* has stripped him, taken his crown, broken him down, and pulled up his hope like a tree. He, in his knowledge of science, has *interposed natural law between him and God.* He is no longer pursued by God. Rather, he pursues himself for the *causes* of his distress. He quests for identity and selfhood. He does not ask God for it. He perceives himself as the discoverer of that which will remain, that which is continuous both within and beyond time. But Alfred North Whitehead asks rightly: "How can one event be the cause of another? In the first place, no event can be wholly and solely the cause of another event. The whole antecedent world conspires to produce a new occasion." [22]

But God did not interpose nature between himself and man. He is sovereign of the universe and interposed man between him and nature. When man sinned as man and continued to sin as a man, God interposed Christ as the Protagonist, the New Adam, between him and man, not nature. In Christ, he has spoken ultimately and everlastingly to man's need for a durable and lasting selfhood, his need for an individuality which is not the pawn of natural law. He has spoken completely to man's need for a covenant and a fellowship which cannot be broken or separated. Man's achieved individuality and his inherited community are shattered and separated, respectively, by the threat of death and alienation. God in Christ has given man the unspeakable gift of the Resurrection whereby death, the epitome of man's loss of his dominion over nature, is conquered once and for all. This is the "new occasion." Through the Resurrection, God restores man's individuality. He who was stripped and threatened with

destruction is now clothed with incorruptibility. He who was "no-body" is now *a* body, a self. He is a self also in a vaster sense. He is a part of the body of Christ, the church. They who were "no-people" are now the people of God. Both the individuality and the communion of the self are *created* and *sustained* in the death, burial, and resurrection of the self with Christ.

The Creation of the Self. W. D. Davies, as has been stated before, says that the formula most frequently used in the New Testament "to describe the nature of the Christian man was that he was 'in Christ.' " [23] The Apostle Paul repeatedly refers to the "new creature" in Christ Jesus our Lord. Old things have passed away. All things have been made new. Sören Kierkegaard also talks about the pre-Christian man as "not having willed to become a self," as in some sense existing but in a real sense of not having been created as a self, although, paradoxically enough, he had been "primitively planned" by God to be a self. This paradox of creation and redemption asks whether redemption is to be seen as a restoration of the self to the original intention of God or as a creation *ex nihilo* of a self that hitherto had no existence at all. The possibility of ethical confusion in the latter interpretation is too great to give an inch to its seeming truth. The unreconstructed self-centeredness of man, bent as it is on its own destruction, is prone to the preference of being a nonentity with the luxury of irresponsibility. The ease with which even superficially related Christians "join" mass movements, "crusading" groups, and lose their identity in this, that, and the other nondescript mob is more than clinical evidence for the above assertion. It is painful judgment upon every Christian who has fallen prey to such.

Rather, by the "creation" of the self, we mean the *re-generation* rather than the generation of the self from nothing. In the sense that the person participates in the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, he becomes a Christian, a new creation takes place, but not a creation from nothing into something. A reconciled and resurrected self is born from an estranged, divided, and destructive self. Death no longer has dominion. The total self, alienated from God and the commonwealth of God, has now become the total self brought into fellowship with both God and the Body of Christ (Ephesians 2:1-22).

Individuality and Selfhood. Participation in the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ brings into being a new individuality of selfhood. Speaking exegetically, J. K. S. Reid says that "the expression 'in Christ' (as used in the New Testament) preserves a clear distinction between the individual and Christ in whom he is, and Paul is never found saying: 'Christ is I and I am Christ.'" This is not a mystical merging of the self into an Overself. It denotes a new identity as a Christian, a new condition or a new situation in the same sense that Paul used the phrases "in these bonds" or "in hunger and thirst," and new relationship to God in Christ. God has ordained in his sovereign love never to see a man again except "in Christ." Man as a self has a whole new perspective and no longer sees any man from a human point of view apart from his identity as a "person for whom Christ died." [24]

This is the self in Christ which by reason of the power of the resurrection is more uniquely individual than it ever could have been otherwise. As Karl Barth says, "the new *man* . . . is not the cosmos, not history in general, not even the articulate or inarticulate masses of nations, classes, or

parties; but it is always the single man, the suffering, working, and knowing subject of society, carrying its need and rejoicing in its hope, and therefore aware of God in his nature and in his life—it is the God-fearing individual who is the first to be touched." [25]

The symbol of Christian baptism as depicted in Paul's discussion of the ethical implications of the birth of the new self beautifully depicts the intensely personal and individual identity of participation in Christ's Resurrection. At the same time, he affirms the fellowship of the church as the Body of Christ. He does not leave us isolated selves without witness with us to our faith: ". . . all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death. We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in the newness of life" (Romans 6:3 b-4).

The apostles at Pentecost preached the vital message of the Resurrection. They baptized those "who received his word." The central concern of baptism both in Acts and in the teachings of Paul is its portrayal of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ as the primary experience of man. Baptism symbolizes this and primarily rests, not upon the tradition of a particular group of Christians nor upon New Testament accounts. Baptism dramatically re-enacts the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ in the life of the individual. Christ for the whole race, as the New Adam, conquered death. This has become effectual in an individual person upon his decisive affirmation of faith in Christ. No one else can do this for him. He must take that place himself as an adult, responsible, deciding individual, affirming his freedom in Christ. Baptism is not his ex-

perience of redemption in itself, because unless that which baptism symbolizes has already taken place, one cannot in truth be baptized. Herein is his individuality symbolized.

The Self in Communion. The distortion of Christian individualism moves in direct proportion, however, to the insistence upon dead forms of religion—whatever they may be—apart from the power they symbolize. Religion becomes sick with self-centeredness and self-sufficiency which poses as piety. A student recently brought from his pastoral field work the story of a father who would not let the church baptize his sixteen-year-old son. His reason, he said, was that the family is the church and the father is the pastor. Therefore, he and his children did not need the church. He would baptize his own son, because *he* was his pastor! This he actually did. Lest we think this true only of rural people, let us take this individualism one step further with the observation of a pastor who serves a large church in a huge metropolitan area of the northeastern United States. A forty-year-old man, whose wife was mentally sick from evil spirits (she said), told the pastor: "I do not need to go to church. I *am* the church. I can worship in myself." Then the pastor says: "Of course, to prove his point, he uses the Scripture, I Corinthians 6:19: '. . . your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit . . .'" [26]

The most devastating reason we can have for withholding fellowship from a fellow Christian is a self-sufficient boast: "I have no need of him." This is a criticism rightly leveled at large, politically powerful, and culturally unified denominations, as well as an understanding of the sick self. Too often denominations say: *We do not need other groups.* This is a drastically different ground of separateness from that used by New Testament Christians when

they withdrew fellowship from Ananias or that used by English Baptists when they protested against established church use of state power for persecution of minorities. The protest of a powerful group, boasting in its self-sufficiency, is very different from the protest of a minority religious group proclaiming the sovereignty of God and the fellowship of free believers. The same motive of self-sufficiency also prompts, however, the use of ecumenical pyramiding of ecclesiastical power trusts. The ecumenical effort itself can be prey to the purposes of wielding political influence, competing effectively with Catholicism, and punishing "fringe groups" by using them as "whipping boys" as a substitute for compassionate understanding. The motive of self-sufficiency, of "having no need" for the unco-operative, nonecumenical group, may be in evidence in the sentimental distortions of the "unity we seek."

Contrary to both forms of self-sufficiency, the fellowship of Christians is the Living Body of Christ. He is the Head "from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by every joint with which it is supplied, when each part is working properly, makes bodily growth and upbuilds itself in love" (Ephesians 4:16). The eye cannot say to the hand that it has no need of it. The party cry of self-sufficiency is the death knell of fellowship. False dichotomies take the place of wisdom and dedication. Cunning ideas and the organization of power groups take the place of the work of the Holy Spirit in the living fellowship of Christ. Wounds are followed by infection and pain. These are followed by separation and isolation. Actual illness and death are not far away.

We need not look back to some halcyon day when these ~~Christ died and because of the witness a Christian bears~~ things were not so. We cannot act as if the scientific revo-

lution were not a part of our cultural biography. Nor can we assume that the Middle Ages were the golden age of Christianity when "great" scholars saw the world as a totality and had a "perfected" theology. Neither can we assume that even in the New Testament the forces of death within the life of the church itself were not aggressively at work. The very earliest expression of the *koinonia* sent Ananias and his wife out feet first in death. Sentimental pietists of today do not like to read this; Luke, the physician, did not hesitate to record it. Furthermore, the church at Sardis (not the transcendent vision of the Body of Christ described in Ephesians, but the particular church on a certain piece of geography named Sardis, filled with the ambiguity of time and human beings) is said by the Revelator to have retained the name of being alive when it was dead.

Changing churches would not have solved the problem either. One might have moved to Laodicea, but it also was neither hot nor cold. If he had lived in an earlier day, he might have drawn the fate of being a member of the fellowship at Corinth, but he would have had to have a strong stomach. They could put Peyton Place in the shade! No! the gospel of the resurrection looks upon human mortality with a dreadfully realistic appreciation of the powers of darkness to work the work of death. Utopianism has never enchanted the genuine participant in the power of the Resurrection. The whole positive affirmation of the Fellowship of the Living Hope in Christ rests upon the hard reality of death itself. At the same time that the Apostle Paul, for instance, proclaimed he had been crucified with Christ, he nevertheless saw the necessity of dying daily. The frailty and mortality of the churches of the New Testament, the Church of the Middle Ages, the churches

of today, and of any coming great Church of the future in human history—all these attest to the reality of the powers of darkness against which the power of the Resurrection is continually being demonstrated, and from which it draws its daily relevance.

The power of the Resurrection produces the vision of the New Jerusalem, in which the clefts within man's selfhood, the shattering separations within the Christian fellowship, the tearful bereavements of human love, and the mysterious and ineradicable pain we carry are transcended with the very presence of the living God. The mourning of the bereaved, the tears of the embittered, the pain of the incurably ill, and the darkness of the pitifully withdrawn will be overcome by the comforting presence, the cleansing of our eyes of all tears, and the permanent transcendence of bodily pain. In other words, the selfhood of the Resurrection ultimately will not be just more of the same kind of selfhood we experience in time. It will be qualitatively different, as qualitatively different as the selfhood we now have is different from that of lower animals. But it will not be so completely different as to isolate us from or leave us irresponsible for our present history, either as individuals or as a Christian community. Real continuity of identity and judgment will remain. Whatever emotions we have there, they will be free of disappointment. I like to think they will be filled with the free laughter of happy children. The judgment of the "bodies" which are to come falls upon the "somebodies," "nobodies," and antipathies of this "body." The ridiculously difficult simplicity of the secret of selfhood will be revealed: "He that loseth his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it."

NOTES FOR CHAPTER FOUR

1. Emil Brunner, *Eternal Hope* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954), p. 143.
2. *Systematic Theology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), Vol. II, p. 157.
3. John Knox, *Jesus Lord and Christ* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), p. 118. It needs to be said here, however, that this author doubts that Knox gives nearly enough weight to the original relationship between Jesus and his disciples before the crucifixion in the establishment of the church. The church was born in his earthly ministry and reborn in his resurrection.
4. W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: S.P.C.K., 1958), pp. 86, 317-318. By permission.
5. W. Norman Pittenger, *The Word Incarnate* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), pp. 68-69. By permission.
6. Rudolf Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), p. 213.
7. Emil Brunner, *I Believe in the Living God* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), p. 92.
8. Augustine, Sermon CCXLVI, 4.
9. *Eternal Hope, op. cit.*, p. 147.
10. Athanasius, "On the Incarnation," Archibald Robertson, tr., *Christology of the Later Fathers*, E. R. Hardy, ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954), p. 63.
11. Gordon W. Allport, *Becoming* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1955), pp. 49 ff.
12. *The Meaning of Death*, Hermann Feifel, ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959), p. 123.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 128.
14. Fyodor Dostoyevsky, *The Brothers Karamozov*, Constance Garnett, tr. (New York: The Modern Library), p. 343.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 347.
16. William E. H. Lecky, *The History of European Morals* (New York: D. Appleton, 1879), Vol. II, p. 102.
17. James I. McCord, "The Seminary and the Theological Mission," *Theology Today*, Vol. XVII, No. 3, p. 292.
18. Reinhold Seeberg, *Textbook of the History of Doctrines*, C. E. Hay, tr. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1956), p. 58.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 117. Anders Nygren aptly comments: "Death is the judgment of God upon human life in its entirety, and resurrection is the renewal of human life in its entirety, by God's love. It was a true sense of the issues involved in the contrast in question (between *agape* and *eros*) that led early Christian writers to insist on the belief in "the resurrection of the flesh" in opposition to the "spiritualizing" tendencies of Graeco-Hellenistic thought . . . which treats life as a natural product dependent upon the inborn quality of the soul, instead of seeing in it the personal operation of God's omnipotence and love." (*Agape and Eros,* Part I, P. S. Watson, tr. London: S.P.C.K., 1932, p. 225.)

20. Seeberg, *op. cit.*, p. 159.
21. Norman O. Brown, *Life Against Death. The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History* (New York: Random House, Inc.; Copyright © 1959 by Wesleyan University), p. 309. By permission.
22. Alfred North Whitehead, *Modes of Thought* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938), p. 225.
23. W. D. Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 86.
24. J. K. S. Reid, "The Phrase 'In Christ'," *Theology Today,* Vol. XVII, No. 3, pp. 353 ff.
25. Karl Barth, *The Word of God and the Word of Man,* Douglas Horton, tr. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958, first published in 1928), p. 95. By permission.
26. Personal communication by letter.

The Holy Spirit and the Self in Process

> . . . we rejoice in our sufferings, knowing that suffering produces endurance, and endurance produces character, and character produces hope, and hope does not disappoint us, because God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us (Romans 5:3-5).
>
> The very fact that our life is able to contain suffering, inner conflict, and death that are not a mere series of events in our life but the entrance to restoration and to life is because of the fact that the Spirit has put the crucified and risen Christ into our Life as a present reality.[1]

The encounter with Christ which decisively focuses the selfhood of man happens both as a beginning and a process, a birth and a development. Both the birth and the development of the self involve stress. Decisive convergences of selfhood do not happen by sheer will power nor without the participant presence of God and what Lewis Sherrill called the "struggle of the soul" of man. Amid these struggles, the participant presence of God was experienced by Jesus and the early church in the person of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit was intimately associated with Jesus as the Christ, but as distinctly a person other than Jesus him-

136

self. The Holy Spirit was perceived as the gift of the Father upon the request of the Son. He participated with them and guided the continuing development of the Christians as individual selves and as selves in community with each other. The concern of this chapter will be to explore the meaning and work of the Holy Spirit in the processes of Christian selfhood.

The Selfhood of the Holy Spirit

The question has been recurrently asked: "If the Resurrection has made the Living Christ accessible to us, why is the Holy Spirit necessary?" This question strikes at the heart of the identity of the Holy Spirit and deserves attention at the outset of this discussion. Furthermore, the relevance of the question for the next chapter on the Trinity is inescapable. We need first of all to approach the question from the internal evidence of the Scriptures. Jesus himself, in something more than a passing manner, perceived the Holy Spirit as his own Counselor in his pilgrimage of selfhood. If, as we have assumed, his mother gave him an interpretation of his own destiny from birth, she must have told him of the ministry of the Holy Spirit in her own life. All three Synoptists record the story of his baptism and tell of the witness of the Holy Spirit to his relationship to the Father at that time (Mark 1:10; Matthew 3:16; Luke 3:22). They also witness that the Holy Spirit drove Jesus out into the wilderness. All three Synoptists say he was tempted of the devil. Jesus, following the prophetic witness of Isaiah to the Holy Spirit, attributed his own vocation to the anointing of the Holy Spirit. Jesus himself declared that it was by the Spirit that he cast out demons, for the

Spirit is the very finger of God (Matthew 12:28; Luke 11:20).

Jesus not only received the meaning of his own personal history and anointing in his lifework through the Holy Spirit: the Holy Spirit participated with him in the continuing processes of his earthly life. He communicated this same promise to his disciples. He told them that the Holy Spirit would teach them what to say in the hour of their trial before men (Matthew 10:20 and Luke 12:12). In teaching them the meaning of prayer, he told them that the Father would give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. And, finally, to sin against the Holy Spirit left one without forgiveness (Mark 3:28-30; Matthew 12:31 ff.; and Luke 12:10). This evidence from the Synoptists does not leave much room for the assumption that the Johannine corpus alone is responsible for the autonomous selfhood of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Person of Christ. The Fourth Gospel seems to present an expansion and elaboration of the Synoptic teachings concerning the Holy Spirit. For example, John 14:16-31 appears to enlarge upon Matthew 19:20, and Luke 24:49 seems to be expanded in John 16:7-14. The fulfilled promises in the life of the early church gave them empirical basis for a more detailed exegesis of the ministry of the Holy Spirit as they recorded it in the Fourth Gospel.

However, the question as to the identity and selfhood of the Living Christ apart from that of the Holy Spirit can be approached another way. The integrity of the selfhood of Jesus requires the separateness of the Holy Spirit, else his own prayers would have been unlike our own. He would have had an access to God that he did not and could not make available to us. Thus his humanity would

not have been complete. Also, his own continuing selfhood in all its distinctness was intensified by the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. Furthermore, the Holy Spirit was not "retired" after the resurrection for the very reason that his continuing work had really begun upon the commissioning of the early church. The Incarnation continued in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the life of the church. The unique identity of the Holy Spirit and of the Living Christ can be seen most vividly in a double action between them. The words of Jesus and the example of Jesus were continually recovered from the peril of legalism (see II Corinthians 3:6) by the Holy Spirit, and the early Christian's experience of the Holy Spirit was saved from fanaticism by the measure of the Living Christ. (See I Corinthians 12:1-3.)[2]

The best evidence for the separate selfhood of the Holy Spirit, however, appears in the inspired guidance of the responses of the developing self of Christians, both ancient and modern, both as individuals and as a continuing community of selves in the church. Norman Pittenger explains it thus: "The Holy Spirit is not confined to but defined by Spirit known and shared in the Christian response to Jesus Christ. . . . Just as Jesus Christ is the *focus* of the whole of the God-world activity, so the Holy Spirit in faith and worship is the *focus* of all divinely guided response to whatever God has made known." [3] The continuing encounter of the developing self in process through the divinely guided responses of the self to the revelation of God in Christ will be the main concern of these pages. We shall discuss the work of the Holy Spirit in focusing the power of life in the self, in focusing the issues of identity at the growing edge

of conflict and suffering, and in ordering the interacting field of relationships in the life of the church.

The Holy Spirit and the Focus of the Power of Life in the Self

The Nicene Creed says: "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Giver of Life." The Apostle Paul calls the Holy Spirit "the Spirit of Life" who sets man free from the law of sin and death. The person who sets his mind on the Spirit receives "life and peace." God who raised Jesus Christ from the dead "will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit which dwells in you." (See Romans 8:1-10.) Both the creed and the New Testament affirm the Holy Spirit as the Giver of Life. Life is the power of being, "the capacity for correlation, persistence, and individuality, for growing, multiplying and developing, for behaviour, experience and experiment. . . ." [4] But the most characteristic feature of life is power or energy. When we look at life this way, the Holy Spirit as the Giver of Life is the One who energizes, gives power. Jesus told the disciples: "And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you; but stay in the city, until you are clothed with power from on high" (Luke 24:49). Before this, Luke tells us that Jesus himself returned from the testings in the wilderness in the power of the Spirit.

With this all too brief identification of the Holy Spirit as the Giver of Life, the very energy of the self itself, we catch a scintillating breath of contemporaneity in our previous picture of the Holy Spirit, to use Pittenger's words, as the *focus* of human responses to the revelation of God in Christ. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin asserts that contemporary civilization is moving away from the "conver-

gence of the person in the world's Omega." Rather, he says, we have lost respect for the person and his true nature "by diminishing and eliminating the self into the vast Universal, Collective, All." "Personality is seen as a specifically corpuscular and ephemeral property; a prison from which we must try to escape." We flee from being "pivoted on oneself, to be able to say 'I'." To do this is to close the door on "all the rest" and to set oneself at odds against the All.[5] Then de Chardin says that the very essence of conscious life is in the opposite direction. Life has a convergent nature, centering down upon itself, becoming constantly and increasingly centered, and being brought by this "supercentration into association with all other centres surrounding it." [6] This is the very intention and work of the Holy Spirit. However, we must carefully disentangle moralistic meanings from our use of the word "self."

The theoretical framework of the sciences of biology and psychology is perceptibly shifting away from linear, mechanical, and time-bound understandings of the development of life to field concepts, dynamic relationships of energy systems, and to the relationship between highly organized life systems. As Gardner Murphy defines personality, one gets a glimpse of the mystery of life and spirit: "Man is . . . a nodal region, an organized field within a larger field, a region of perpetual interaction, a reciprocity of outgoing and incoming energies." [7]

As Murphy further says, the whole field of the psychology of personality must undergo a radical change of method which will include man's need in some way to "come to terms with the cosmos as a whole." He talks of man's loneliness in the contemplation of his responses to the cosmos as a whole. Christian theology has, in turn, too

long been under the unconscious persuasion of antiquated psychological frames of reference, none of which is particularly indigenous to or necessarily compatible with the inner intention and meaning of the Scriptures. Prescott Lecky has said that "we have to build a new psychology as different from the old as modern physics is different from Newtonian mechanism." [8] The Holy Spirit is the Power of Life itself. The Holy Spirit focuses the selfhood of man in his history, vocation, and destiny in a constantly renewing encounter with Jesus Christ. He brings to fully personal dimensions the pivotal convergences of both man's individual and man's social relationships. Such an understanding lays hold of the vastly suggestive contributions of de Chardin, Murphy, and Lecky. In turn, this understanding provides a conceptual framework for appreciating and participating in the conflicts of individuals and groups as a creative growth rather than as legalistic defensiveness; for, as Paul again says, ". . . the written code kills, but the Spirit gives life" (II Corinthians 3:6).

However, the power of life in the Spirit focuses man's responses to God in opposition to the testing, tempting, distracting power of the Devil, as he is personified in the New Testament. The Apostle Paul said that he was not ignorant of the designs of Satan (II Corinthians 2:11). In Paul's teachings, the Holy Spirit gives freedom, but the spirit of bondage again unto death is the result of the law, sin, and Satan at work. In the Synoptic accounts, the Holy Spirit leads Jesus into the wilderness, but Satan himself tempts him. Jesus is portrayed by the Apostle Paul as having "disarmed the principalities and powers and made a public example of them, triumphing over them in him" (Colossians 2:15). Whereas the temper of the modern

mind has rejected crude anthropomorphisms concerning the satanic powers of the world, nevertheless both contemporary drama and existential theology have reasserted the power of the demonic to destroy life, to create a false center or concentration of life, to drive a man to confuse self-affirmation with self-destruction.[9] No account of the Holy Spirit at work in the pilgrimage of selfhood of man is complete without the persistent recognition of the deceptive, destructive, and distorting work of the Evil One. The psychological discussion of personal inner conflict can be separated from the ontological dimensions of the cosmic "powers of darkness," as the New Testament calls them. But the result is a sentimental rather than realistic view of conflict. However, a clear understanding of this larger conflict is best grasped through an appreciation of the work of the Holy Spirit at the growing edge of man's personal conflicts and sufferings.

The Holy Spirit and the Growing Edge of Conflict and Suffering

Regin Prenter says: "Inner conflict may be said to be the battleground where the decisive final struggle between the law and the gospel, death and life, Satan and the Holy Spirit is fought. Therefore, the place where we may learn to know the Holy Spirit is in the school of inner conflict." [10] Prenter says this in his research on Luther's concept of the Holy Spirit, which was a concept in which the experience of *Anfechtung*, or conflict and/or temptation, plays a major role. Prenter sets Luther over against the scholastics who made the major difference between man as a sinner and God a metaphysical difference characterized by the smooth continuity between the natural and the supernatural.

Spiritual development in the scholastic view, says Prenter, makes "it possible to understand victory over sin and sanctification as elements in the same smooth transitory process which gradually lifts man from the level of the natural to the level of the supernatural." [11] But for Luther the consciousness of sin was wrought by the Holy Spirit in bringing the self to a focused awareness of inner conflict, a "radical self-condemnation." "The new life begins by the crucifying of the old man when he through inner conflicts is made to conform with the Christ of humiliation. The happy will is the will which in the unutterable groanings from the hell of inner conflict is made to conform with the will of God." [12] Luther himself says that the life of faith in Christ through the Holy Spirit must "first become manifest in times of trial (*Anfechtung*), as, for example, when faith must overcome sin, death, devil and hell. These are not insignificant foes. They make you sweat; they crush your bones; they make heaven and earth seem too narrow for you." [13]

Thus spiritual development comes to pass as the Holy Spirit decisively focuses the self at the growing edge of the temptations, conflicts. The work of the Holy Spirit as Counselor is demonstrated crucially at the point of the individual's or group's acceptance of or resistance to responsibility for resolving the conflict according to the mind of God in Christ. The consolidation of each particular conflict is what Havighurst has called a "developmental task." Human development is not, says Seward Hiltner, "a mere unfolding gradualism, as if crisis and decision were completely foreign bodies." [14] The Holy Spirit works within the ambiguities of human decision and development, never conferring infallibility nor superseding the freedom of hu-

man judgment in making decisions. For example, Agabus was evidently speaking for the Christians at Caesarea when he inferred to Paul that the Holy Spirit advised against the Apostle's going to Jerusalem. However, when Paul would not be persuaded, they changed their minds. The Holy Spirit in the life of today, as Pittenger says, "works in men not to destroy their human capacities and their God-given insight into truth, but to confirm and strengthen, to enlighten and inform, to correct and enlarge those capacities and that insight." [15] The conflicts which men experience are "teachable moments" under the instructive tutelage of the Holy Spirit.

Recent psychological research on personality and selfhood reflects interpretations of conflict in the development of the self which are freshly illuminative of the point of view concerning the work of the Holy Spirit in human conflict and development set forth here. Particularly relevant are these findings to Luther's interpretation of the Holy Spirit and man's inner conflicts. J. W. Perry, for example, considers consciousness and conflict coextensive with each other and finds the Genesis account relevant: "According to the Paradise myth, it was the Evil One who propelled the first couple into their move toward consciousness and conflict. . . ." [16] Erik Erikson, in his study of Luther's personal biography, says that "human nature can best be studied in the state of conflict. . . ." [17] He says that Luther saw Christ as very God and his own inner conflicts as the proving ground of the knowledge of God and the self. "The Passion is all that man can know of God; his conflicts duly faced, are all he can know of himself. The last Judgment is always present self-judgment." [18]

In addition to these, Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman

have discussed the therapeutic aspects of "excitement and growth in personality." Their reflections concerning conflict and therapy are not merely relevant to the observable aspects of the New Testament witness concerning the work of the Holy Spirit in the excitement and development of personality. They are not simply points of view which are exceptionally in accord with a given author's understanding. They have the breath of reality and life upon them and correspond meaningfully to life as it is lived. These authors use the *Gestalt* concepts of the "ground" and "figure" to state their position: "Conflict is a disturbance of the homogeneity of the ground and prevents the emergence of a sharp and lively next figure. . . . The function of the self is to live it through, to suffer loss and change and alter the given." [19] Emotional suffering is not an evil in itself to be removed, as Anton Boisen has said, "like a vermiform appendix." To the contrary, "emotional suffering is a means of preventing the isolation of the problem, in order that, working through the conflict, the self may grow in the field of the existent." [20] They reject the notion that conflict, whether social, interpersonal, or intrapsychic is wasteful of energy. They contend that this is a "plausible but superficial" theory. "Where a conflict is deeply concernful, *what* to do, what belongs to oneself rather than to a stereotyped norm, is just what is being tested." The very self is undergoing a process of redefinition of purpose, goal, and intention. "Even more, the true work to be done, perhaps even the true vocation is being discovered in the conflict; it has not hitherto been known to anybody . . . the conflict is a collaboration—going beyond what is intended, toward a new figure altogether." [21]

From the psychotherapeutic point of view, "no conflict

should be dissolved. . . . Especially the 'inner' conflicts are energized and concernful and are means of growth. The task of psychotherapy is to make them aware so they may feed on new environmental material and come to crisis." However, the resistances to doing just this are "stubborn, combative," and always "counterattacking," according to Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman. They seem to impute life, strong energy, and concernful intention to these negativities of existence. Of course, as one might expect, they do not discuss the ontological structure of inner conflict. Nevertheless, the empirical, psychological dimensions of conflict are vividly described. The theologically concerned psychotherapists such as Jung and some of his interpreters describe these resistances as having a "separate existence of their own." Operating outside of the self as part-processes, they exercise their power to disrupt the total equilibrium and distort the direction and vocation of the total self.

The Interpersonal Ground of Conflict. The development of the self from crisis to crisis is attended by the definitive work of the Holy Spirit in several specific ways. The primary mode of encounter of the individual self by the Holy Spirit is *in relation to the Christian community.* F. W. Dillistone says "that life exists in relation, may be regarded as axiomatic, and this may be looked upon as the primary manifestation of the Spirit." [22] Also, Gordon Allport says from a psychological point of view: ". . . the ground of the social group gives the individual his figured character." [23] From a theological point of view, the Holy Spirit moves within the covenanted community of faith as well as within the individual to define and nurture the specific sense of history, calling, and destiny of that person.

For example, the Holy Spirit works within the community of faith in the fellowship of remembrance and celebration. Very early the Christians *celebrated* the Resurrection of Christ on the first day of the week. This became the Christian day of worship. As Angus Dun comments, "all human communities . . . are in part communities of memory." [24] Also, the celebration of the Lord's Supper is done in remembrance of Christ. The Holy Spirit sensitizes the ethical awareness of the individual to breaches in his fellowship with other Christians as he partakes with them of the Lord's Supper. The Christian reminds himself of the shape of things to come as he shares in the re-enactment of the death of Christ in the broken body and poured blood of Christ.

Furthermore, the Holy Spirit works in the fellowship of believers as a community in the consensual validation of the calling and vocation of the individual. The individual *charismata* of gifts of the Holy Spirit are always tested and affirmed by the communal *cheirotonia* or laying on of hands of the church. R. B. Hoyle observes that the Holy Spirit "supervised every advance of the church" in the account set forth in Acts. Paul and Barnabas, for example, were commissioned by the church at Antioch upon the instructions of the Holy Spirit (Acts 13:2-3). Yet this is not without conflict, because different people felt endowed by the Holy Spirit with different gifts. Different churches felt led by the Holy Spirit in different directions. As a result conflict arose. The Holy Spirit was at work, therefore, in the resolution of social conflict in the disagreement over the extension of the church fellowship to the Gentiles. In Acts 15:6 ff. we see that there was much disputing, and yet it was finally resolved under the tutelage of the

Holy Spirit that the gift of the Spirit was to the Gentiles as well as the Jews.[25]

Several factors in the resolution of social conflict reside in the living situation of the church. Kurt Lewin suggests that these factors are basic to resolving any conflictual situation. First, Lewin identifies two foundations for wholehearted individual action within a given group: *belief that the group is going in the right direction* and, second, *primary trust in the leader of the group.*[26] These two foundations provide a group atmosphere of confidence and trust. The early church was able to resolve conflicts of direction through the tutelage of the Holy Spirit in that they did not move upon the political ideal of "the majority rule," but upon the firm intention to seek the gladness and singleness of heart of the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The problems arising out of a diverse leadership, also, were met by the appeal for the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. There were many gifts but one giver of the gifts, the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Truth, and, to use Lewin's words: "A far more stable ground for morale than the belief in any leader individually is truth itself." [27]

In the second place, Lewin says that *certainty of belongingness* provides the basis for reconciliation within a group. The certainty of belongingness depends upon the commitment of the individuals to the directions of the group and the durability of the covenant that binds them together. The Christian's identity has been defined in relationship to a covenant of trust in Christ. He shares this with other Christians. They belong not because of merit of their own, but because of the act of God in Christ. The crucial struggle in the early church was over the certainty

of the belongingness of the Gentiles. The Jewish Christians themselves were in the throes of rightly interpreting their own history in the Law of Judaism at the same time. The introduction of Gentiles into the group created conflict. The focus of the conflict was the uncertainty of belongingness of the Gentiles. The conflict tested the willingness of the church to be led by the Holy Spirit rather than by considerations of political expediency. To have done the latter would have been to breed and confirm an "in-group" and an "out-group" which would have been institutionalized and would have perpetuated the conflict. The conflict would then have become a chronic way of life, demonically determined by the political power structure rather than by the Holy Spirit's ministry of love to the situation-as-a-whole.

Yet, the Holy Spirit accomplished these purposes in contradistinction to the powers of darkness which elevate majority and minority divisions to the center of worship and make idolaters of people who have responded only partially to the gospel and often for other than religious reasons. The Holy Spirit accomplishes his purposes in the resolution of social and personal conflict through the sense of direction, the kind of leadership, and the vocational commitment he elicits from the responses of faith in the church. An individual's likeliness of being able to respond depends in turn upon his sense of certainty in belonging to the fellowship. This can be extended by the group as a witness to the love that is in Christ, or it can be extended for some lesser reason, or it can be withheld altogether. For example, today a Negro person may be included in a Christian community because he is a person for whom Christ died and because of the witness a Christian bears

to the power of Christ to remove dividing walls of hostility within the Christian fellowship. Or, a Negro may be welcomed in order to demonstrate how "unprejudiced" we are, or for exhibition purposes, or for the less conscious reason of confirming a covert feeling of superiority to him, or for purely political purposes of getting votes if one is running for office. The same act is constant in all these situations, but the motives and end result are drastically different.

Whether a vicious or a benevolent circle is set in motion in an impending conflict depends upon the faithfulness of the Christian community to what Jesus taught. He taught us to accept, forgive, and to love one another as he accepted, forgave, and loved us. He gave us the gift of the Holy Spirit who sheds abroad the love of God in our hearts. He brings to our remembrance the teachings of Jesus in the new context of the testing situation of conflict, both individually and corporately. The quintessence of Jesus' teaching is the loving covenant of his crucifixion. The Christian's certainty of belonging does not depend upon his race, his or her sex, marital or parental status, economic or social position, creed, or political affiliation. We can go further and say that his certainty of belonging in the Christian fellowship does not depend upon his adherence to legal codes of righteousness which are used as tests of membership and participation. Nor does it depend upon his particular degree of "mental health" as a personal achievement. These become demonic structures by which we ourselves refuse to enter the kingdom of God and shut up the doors to others whereby they may not enter. Yet decisions about these cannot be made without conscious consultation of and leadership by the Holy Spirit.

In the Holy Spirit there is freedom, and wide margins of human frailty of perception are apparent in the New Testament churches' interpretation of the intention of the Holy Spirit. They recognized that the Holy Spirit both approved and forbade action on some of their decisions, yet they experienced the Holy Spirit as the searcher of hearts and evaluator of motives. They knew that he could be "resisted," "tempted," "grieved," and "lied against." To do these things was to lie to the Holy Spirit, and was not unto men but "unto God." The crucial work of the Holy Spirit in both individual and social conflict is the refinement of the motives of men, assaying the dross and clarifying the adulteration or wholeness of the decisions springing from these motives. The patient process of testing and refinement *is* the meaning of conflict, and the revelation of a wholehearted direction of united of faith in the bonds of peace *is* the resolution. Through the resolution growth takes place and the community is "built up" and edified in love.

The Christian community is moved from immaturity to maturity through conflict, then, by the indwelling activity of the Holy Spirit. The despair of "things ever straightening out" is the main temptation. The heart of the temptation is to adopt the conflict as a way of life and make the best of it for one's own purposes. Here, as we have said before, is where despair turns into cynicism and becomes idolatry. To the contrary, the work of the Holy Spirit moves a community away from despair to hope, a "hope that does not disappoint." The gifts once used as means of dividing the community are now used as avenues of adoration of the Giver of every good and perfect gift. The leadership of this or that person is recognized for all

its strength and weaknesses and the Holy Spirit is looked upon as leader whereas "no man is called leader." Leadership is now measured accurately in terms of responsibility and service, not in terms of authority and power over men. It has been said by Berdyaev and others that no man is free so long as he needs to have power over others. Nor is any man free who accepts status without commensurate responsibility in the community. But under the leadership of the Holy Spirit, a whole community may live in a renewed sense of hope once a conflict is even on its way toward resolution.

The potential for growth in a community depends upon this sense of hope. "Only when the person gives up hope does he stop 'actively reaching out'; he loses his energy, he ceases planning, and, finally, he even stops wishing for a better future." [28] The Christian community can, through the processes of suffering, develop endurance and character which issue in hope. The community of remembrance in the Holy Spirit moves through the maturing power of the community of suffering as a creative vocation to become the community of expectation and hope. Such a community becomes a thesaurus of experience accumulated over the years through which the individuals within it can grow as living selves in relation to each other in the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit and the Figured Character of the Self. Let us summarize the discussion of the Holy Spirit and the self in process up to this point. We have accepted the axiom of the personal identity of the Holy Spirit as the gift of the Father upon the request of the Son. We have discussed the unique work of the Holy Spirit. We have moved upon the assumption that the Holy Spirit works

creatively and definitively in the development of the self in the stringencies of inner and interpersonal conflict. We have discussed the relational ground of the work of the Holy Spirit in the encounter of the developing self amid creative conflict.

Now we are in a position to discuss the work of the Holy Spirit in the processes of inner or personal conflict within the self. The figured character of the self is not brought to a clear image out of the diffuse identity of the region of the psychic totality of human life itself without much inner tension and stress. There are many strong configurations contending with each other for the central focus of the total being in true selfhood.[29] This contention is a state of inner conflict which must be brought to focus in consciousness and dealt with decisively in crisis. This focusing and resolution of inner conflict is the very process of learning and development of the self. The Holy Spirit as Teacher works in, beneath, and above the process to make conflict conscious, to give support in the confrontation of the conflict and to guide the conflict to correspondence with the Mind of Christ.

The conflictual character of the course of Christian development is not a smoothly contoured ascent from one stage to another. Nor is it ever completed and finished. Seward Hiltner says, "The first thing we know about religious development is that, whatever its specific nature, it is not a mere unfolding . . . it has spurts, plateaus, dips. It contains optimal occasions which if not taken at the flood, may lose something irretrievable. . . ."[30] The processes of judgment, quite apart from the attitudes of acceptance and mercy every sinner shows another, are being wrought out in the *kairoi* of existence. The explicit

religious content of these eschatologically decisive moments is clarified in the work of the Holy Spirit.

John Calvin comments clearly on the uneven yet certain course of Christian development when he says: "We are never so well in the course of the present life as to be entirely cured of the disease of distrust, and completely replenished and engrossed by faith." Calvin speaks of the course of spiritual development as having its "steps back." He says, with Paul in Ephesians 6:16, that faith is the Christian soldier's shield in the conflicts of existence. "Hence, when faith is shaken, it is just as when, by the violent blow of a javelin, a soldier standing firm is forced to step back and yield a little; and again, when faith is wounded, it is as if the shield were pierced, but not perforated by the blow." [31] He goes further and says that ". . . though we are shaken, we are not therefore driven from our place. The invariable issue of the contest is, that faith in the long run surmounts the difficulties by which it was beset and seemed to be endangered." [32]

Lest we resign ourselves to a fate of irresolvable conflict, however, we must turn to an understanding of the internal witness of the Holy Spirit in the creative solution of conflict and the resultant growth. We need to reiterate all that was said in Chapter Two about the reconciliation of God and man, flesh and spirit, self-realization and self-commitment in the Incarnation of Christ. The full intention of God in the Holy Spirit is, as the Apostle Paul said of his own relationship to the Galatians, "to continue in travail until Christ be formed in you." The Christian in the Holy Spirit "groans and travails together" with the whole creation. But his conflict is not that of a slave with his master but that of a son with a loving father who brings the

discipline of his spirit to the son, never relieving him of the imperatives of growth in his own inner conflicts. (See Galatians 4:19, Romans 8:18-25; Galatians 4:5-7.) The work of the Holy Spirit within the community and within the individual is always a work of reconciliation through forgiveness of sin through the charter act of Christ in his atoning grace. We ask, however, about the "how" or the process of this work in the conflictual identity of man. This needs clarification in the following pages. However, no attempt is made or promise offered to remove the basic mystery from this work for that cannot be done and should not be attempted.

The Holy Spirit works faithfully in the individual at at least three points of focus in his identity—history and heritage, vocation and calling, destiny and hope. These points of focus have been used in this book as the basic premise whereby in encounter with Christ the identity of man is focused in a clear sense of selfhood. The further consideration here is to see the power of conflict in this encounter, to recognize that the conflict continues in personal development within the Christian covenant, and to relate these conflicts to the work of the Holy Spirit.

Conflicts from the Memory. The Holy Spirit participates in the processes of memory. One of the things we mean when we say that the Holy Spirit inspired the Scriptures is that he participated in the processes of retention, recall, and re-presentation of the things that Jesus both said and did. In the presence of trying situations, Jesus promised that the Holy Spirit would give the Christian in that hour what he should say. The person who has already confessed his history of sin to the Lord Jesus Christ and received forgiveness nevertheless continues to undergo—now more

than ever—intense inner conflict over his memory of his "walk of life in times past." The painfulness of these memories is often more than one can bear alone. The Holy Spirit stands with one in this reinterpretation of his biography of alienation and estrangement.

Furthermore, the Holy Spirit enables us to stay in touch each with his own cultural heritage. Sometimes, for instance, as was true with certain Christians to whom Paul was writing in I Corinthians 7:12 ff., the decision to become a Christian involves changes in relationship to one's wife or husband who themselves are not Christians. The Apostle gave no encouragement to dispensing with the marital bond for religious reasons. Rather, he and other Christian writers insisted that the decision to marry this person in the days prior to one's encounter with Christ should be held inviolate as far as the Christian was concerned. One's own "conversation of life" might effect the change, early Christians were told. Similarly, the very decision to become a Christian places many persons in conflict with "those of their own household." The use of religion, however, to jettison one's responsibility to his family, rightly perceived, was rejected by Christ himself (Mark 7:10). The conflicts created by the decision to become a Christian often result in autonomy of one's family of orientation and his family of procreation which accentuate his personal development as a self. But this personal development requires a sustained relationship or responsible and mature love for one's kin, nevertheless. The Holy Spirit alone guides in the resolution of the dilemma which these contradictory demands create.

More profoundly than this, however, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of freedom. He works in the deepest recesses of

memory to free the developing self from the conflicts created by the legalisms of his heritage. Paul called this the bondage of the law. For Paul, the Holy Spirit, not the law, was the living principle of the ethical life.[38] At the same time, the law was the main source of inner conflict with Paul. At one time he could boast of being a Pharisee of the Pharisees beyond those of his own age in the things of the law. At another time, he felt that the law was a means and opportunity in him for sin to find its way with him. The conflict between the law of God and the law of sin made a wretched man of him. But the "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," he said, "has set me free from the law of sin and death" (Romans 8:2).

Christianity in many quarters today has in itself been crystallized in tradition, cultural patterns, and family sanctions. The very memory of their early lives in Christian homes is painful for many people. They were taught a religion of law and rejection, not a religion of the Spirit of Life and accepting love. They have received the gospel in such a way that their spirits have rebelled. They have made some decision for Christ out of conformity with the legal demands of their family heritage. Now they can neither wholeheartedly live with their heritage nor wholeheartedly reject it. Hence, they are in conflict. The inner message of the New Testament concerning the Spirit of Life which sets them free from the legalism of their heritage has not reached them. Much of pastoral counseling as it is practiced today is devoted to making conscious the damage done by a legalistic misinterpretation of the Christian faith and communicating the ministry of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit participates in the continued encounter of the Christian self in his conflict over his

heritage of legalism. The relationship of the Christian to the Holy Spirit is radically different from the relationship to a legalistic tradition. It is the difference between the lash of the whip and the breathing of the air. The Holy Spirit and the spirit of the Christian interpenetrate each other the way the air and the body are related to each other; both are in each other and at the same time independent of each other. The Christian gives the Holy Spirit body and is the temple of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit gives life to the Christian and nourishes the life's blood of the Christian.

The Holy Spirit is therapeutically related to the Christian also as one who brings to his remembrance those things of which he is both unconscious and incapable of articulating. The resuscitation of repressed material is in itself a ministry of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, the Holy Spirit brings the material to mind in direct proportion to the already prepared ability to assimilate the material into consciousness. The skilled counselor or psychotherapist has to wait on this readiness, when the strength of the counselee's inner resources match the impact of the new insight. Yet the tacit processes of judgment are at work also. The Holy Spirit does not force a person to retrieve the repressed memories for the nourishment of life itself, nor relieve him of the consequences of his resistance.

Such "grieving" of the Holy Spirit can go only so far until it becomes self-retributive. Lewin has described this resistance as "going-out-of-the-field" *(Aus-dem-Felde-Gehen)* or withdrawal from the reality situation.[34] He says that the successive duration of such withdrawals may increase until finally the person does not return. In the early years of life, the parental use of punishment provides

the axis on which this "going-out-of-the-field" turns. The full-orbed intention of the power of the Holy Spirit is to cast out the fear that prevents the return of the painful memories which originally initiated the withdrawal from reality. Perfect love casts out fear, for fear comes of punishment. But, on the other hand, the grim realism of the New Testament and of some contemporary clinical records describes some detached persons who have gone out of the field of interaction with both God and man. They are beyond the probability if not the possibility of return. As Sullivan expresses it, they "just miss being human." In Christian terms, there is such a thing as sinning against the Holy Spirit. He is the last outpost of God's conquest of evil beyond which man's conscious and unconscious resistance cannot with pardon go.

Conflict in Calling and Vocation. The Holy Spirit participated in the conflictual stresses of Jesus' temptations in the wilderness presenting him with the resources for clarifying his mission under the impact of the Tempter's appeals. The Holy Spirit anointed him to the ministry of healing, reconciliation, and proclamation of good news. In the life of the Apostle Paul, the Holy Spirit directed, as we have said, the church at Antioch to set him apart for the mission to which he was called. The Holy Spirit prevented his going into Bithynia and led him into Macedonia instead. The Apostle Peter found his work with Cornelius approved by the Holy Spirit and entered a new phase of his own personal calling, although he did not do so without conflict. The persistent participation of the Holy Spirit in both creating and resolving the conflicts of calling and vocation can be documented abundantly in the apostolic witness.

Furthermore, the identity of the Gentiles was decisively defined in Christian selfhood. Paul quoted Hosea: "Those who were not my people I will call 'my people,' and her who was not beloved I will call 'my beloved.'" "And in the very place where it was said to them, 'You are not my people,' they will be called 'the sons of the living God.'" The Gentiles had discovered, along with the Jewish Christians, a new image of their identity in the Christian calling (Romans 9:25-26). Yet, as was said earlier, this did not come without both personal and social conflict. The Corinthians, for instance, could not see any great contradiction between their lascivious ways and the calling that was theirs in Christ. The Galatians wanted to return again to the beggarly elements of Judaism. They grew in their perceptions of the gospel of Christ as they learned to feel the conflict between their old selfhood and the new life in Christ.

The calling of God in Christ creates an ever-sharpening ethical conflict, and the selfhood of the individual grows in response to the continuing encounter with the Holy Spirit who supervises this growth. As Paul again says, "For God has not called us for uncleanness, but in holiness. Therefore whoever disregards this, disregards not man but God, who gives his Holy Spirit to you" (I Thessalonians 4:7-8).

Probably the most comprehensive statement of the inter-relationship between the pilgrimage of spiritual maturity in Christ, the nature of the Christian calling, and the work of the Holy Spirit in the perfecting of the individual in community is found in Ephesians 4. We are told that there is one body and one Spirit. We were called to one hope and that belongs to our call. Correspondingly the gifts of

being apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers were given, "for the equipment of the saints, for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ, until we all attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to mature manhood, to the measure . . . of the fullness of Christ . . . so that we may no longer be children. . . . Rather, speaking the truth in love, we are to grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ . . ." (Ephesians 4:12-15).

Yet the conflicts of today in vocation and calling are not between evil and good so much as they are among the vast variety of possibilities in contrast with the clutching necessity of the shortness of life. One is impressed with the way in which people who have successfully mastered one specialty in life are more and more turning to specific Christian vocations (by which in this instance is meant a kind of work) after they have reached adulthood. Modern man struggles to climb up out of the fog back of general humanity into a sense of direction and vocation. This is attended by all manner of conflict, and the crucial work of the Holy Spirit attends the growth that results from decisive response to the calling of God in Christ. But, on the other hand, the Holy Spirit also convicts of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment in the instance of those who shrink back and do not act upon their calling with decisive courage.

Probably the most excruciating conflicts in calling and vocation are in contemporary persons' role-conflicts. The stereotyped patterning of roles for various people stifles true self-encounter. Roles make the activation of the life of the Spirit difficult. For example, a man sees his role as a man too narrowly defined in terms of how "tough" he

can be and how much money he can make. The wife suffers a collision of roles in her definition of her identity both as a homemaker and as one who works outside the home. The parent is caught between the authoritarian and the permissive definitions of his or her role as a parent. The professional person feels the impingement of specialization so heavily that he wonders if he is a whole person or merely an automaton. The minister in particular compares the role-expectations of his congregation with the kinds of time he has and the kinds of training he has received.

The temptations of the role-ridden modern are many. His early years are spent in trying to clarify his identity, sexually, vocationally, and religiously. His young adult years of emancipation are spent in the struggle between accepting and rejecting his professional or occupational role. His mature years after the first flush of success or blush of failure are spent in either limiting the extent of his activities or justifying the role he has taken in his vocation and calling. The seasoned years of middle age are beset by the temptations of the bored and the fatigue that comes from being used by people who are interested in him as a "public figure" against a "background" of social influences but do not care much about him as a self in his own right for his own sake. He reaches the years of retirement with conflict. If his whole selfhood has been absorbed in his work, he loses meaning and reason for living. If his work has been mainly for the purposes of livelihood, he is cramped with economic anxiety.

Therefore, the developmental pilgrimage of the self under calling and vocation is attended by conflict at every stage. The devil departs from us, too, for only a season after the first definitions of our selfhood. The Holy Spirit, one

can expect, is always at hand, also. We can turn to him for the continual renewal of life. The task of clarifying our purposes in life from day to day, year to year, and decade to decade comes attended by the perfecting work of the Holy Spirit. The commission of Christ concludes with the assurance: ". . . I am with you always, to the close of the age." The process of the self is not merely that of the continual sanctification of man through the work of the Holy Spirit. We speak of the *work* of the Holy Spirit advisedly. He has identity and purpose which he shares with us in the continual clarification and simplification of our vocation and calling. Through the Holy Spirit we are laborers together with God.

Conflict in Destiny. Albert Camus has said that the fundamental question needing an answer is whether "life is or is not worth living." [35] The person whose world no longer has any hopeful meaning becomes, he says, "an exile . . . deprived of the memory of a lost home or the hope of a promised land." [36] Camus places suicide at one end of the scale and hope at the other. He assumes that the acceptance of absurdity is the only way to live. Jesus represents the ultimate ambiguity of life on his cross and each one of us has to be crucified and is crucified to a certain degree.[37] Yet, Judas stands as a symbol of the other alternative in human existence, that is, suicide. Therefore, one can suppose that the alternatives for the resolution of futility are twofold: the voluntary taking up of the cross versus the compulsive inescapability of suicide. These alternatives are epitomized on the one hand in Jesus and on the other hand in Judas. But the central problem is why the conflict and ambiguity that man experiences from the dawn of consciousness until death, whatever form

death takes, leaves him in despair. Margaret Mead, at the 1960 Arden House Conference on Religion and the Behavioral Sciences, remarked that the constant factor in all forms of religion is the *sustenance of hope*. Harold Wolff, Professor of Medicine at Cornell University Medical School, in discussing what hope does for man also told about what sudden and unexplainable deaths overtake people who are in complete despair. Suicide, for instance, was twice as frequent among the badly demoralized American prisoners of war in the Orient as was true of those prisoners of war in Europe.

Luther said that no saint has really "learned and fathomed fully the meaning of faith unless he has found himself in despair, in the anguish of death, or in extreme peril." [38] The paradox of both Camus and Luther seems to point in the direction of the birth of a living hope out of honest encounter with suffering and despair. This paradox provides an inner conflict of continuing relevance to the mellowing and maturation of the self. We need to ask the question: Wherein does the Holy Spirit direct our decisive confrontation with suffering and despair and bring hope and a sense of ultimate destiny throughout the developmental pilgrimage of the self?

The prayer of the Apostle Paul sets the framework of thought on this subject: "May the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, so that by the power of the Holy Spirit you may abound in hope" (Romans 15:13). The threat of fatalism in our contemplation of our heritage, the role-riddenness of our sense of vocation and calling, and the basic sense of the worthwhileness of life in our contemplation of our destiny all point to the need for the continual filling of the life with hope. The

pull of existence is a drain on the sense of hope. Each stage of human existence calls for a radical reorganization of the meanings, values, and goals of the individual self. The prayer of the Apostle Paul lays hold of the promise of the renewal of hope at each developmental stage that by the power of the Holy Spirit we may abound in hope.

This perception of the renewing power of the Holy Spirit is reminiscent, to say the least, of what Irenaeus said about Christ's recapitulation of each age range of human life. He said that the Master did not despise or evade any condition of humanity. He did not just set forth truth, but literally sanctified every age, releasing to people of every age group the same power of the resurrection whereby he had "learned obedience" himself by going through every stage as the Exemplar of our salvation. Irenaeus pushed his time categories beyond the facts of biblical record to make Christ even an old man.[39] This "recapitulation" theory would be more accurately stated, it seems, if Irenaeus had related it to the continuing work of the Holy Spirit instead of making the forced distinctions in terms of the historical Jesus. Here the Holy Spirit brings the Living Christ's witness to our remembrance from birth to death, at every conflictual era of the pilgrimage of life. His objective is to bring hope out of despair by the lively alternatives of a deepened and renewed purpose. Thus, though the outward man perish, the inner man is renewed through the freedom that Christ intends, for, in the words of Paul: "Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom. And we all, with unveiled face, beholding the glory of the Lord, are being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord who is the Spirit. Therefore,

having this ministry by the mercy of God, we do not lose heart" (II Corinthians 3:17-18, 4:1). The change takes place in man, not in the Holy Spirit. The selfhood of man is constantly refocused through the worship of the Lord Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit.

Yet even so, we are still transformed in the mystery of both the being of God and the becoming of man. The recapitulative understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit is suggestive but not definitive; provocative of worship but not totally descriptive of him who, as Jesus says, blows where he listeth as the wind. He is the breath of life itself, the rushing of a mighty wind, and the Intercessor who works beyond our capacity to utter his mystery. Even so, the selfhood of man is beyond searching out except by the Holy Spirit himself.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER FIVE

1. Regin Prenter, *Spiritus Creator,* J. M. Jensen, tr. (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1953), p. 54. By permission.
2. This question is treated with polemical thoroughness from a systematic theological point of view by Athanasius. See *The Letters of Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit,* C. R. B. Shapland, tr. (London: Epworth Press, 1951). The question was not specifically dealt with in the New Testament but was wrought out in the Christological and Trinitarian controversies of the postcanonical era of the Fathers. However, the New Testament evidence assumes a clear distinction between Christ and the Holy Spirit, although the teachings of the Apostle Paul reflect intimate interpenetration of the life of the Holy Spirit, the Living Christ, and the participant believer. The phrases "in the Spirit," "in Christ," and "in the Lord" are used in overlapping senses. (See Romans 8:9-11; I Corinthians 3:16 and 6:19.)
3. W. Norman Pittenger, *The Word Incarnate* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), p. 250.

4. *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* Vol. 8, p. 8.
5. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), p. 258.
6. *Ibid.*
7. Gardner Murphy, *Personality: A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structures* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947), p. 767.
8. *Self-Consistency* (New York: Island Press, 1945), p. 38.
9. See Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), Vol. II, pp. 51-55.
10. *Spiritus Creator, op. cit.,* p. 208. By permission of Muhlenberg Press.
11. *Ibid.,* p. 39. By permission.
12. *Ibid.,* p. 17. By permission.
13. Martin Luther, *Works,* American Edition, Jaroslav Pelikan, ed. (St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1958), Vol. XXIII, p. 73.
14. Seward Hiltner, "Darwin and Religious Development," *The Journal of Religion,* Vol. XL, No. 4, Oct., 1960, p. 291.
15. *The Word Incarnate, op. cit.,* p. 14.
16. J. W. Perry, *The Self in Psychotic Process* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953), p. 71.
17. Erik Erikson, *The Young Man Luther* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1958), p. 16.
18. *Ibid.*
19. Frederick Perls, Ralph Hefferline, Paul Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy: Excitement and Growth in Human Personality* (New York: Julian Press, Inc., 1951), p. 412. By permission.
20. *Ibid.,* p. 360. By permission.
21. *Ibid.,* p. 356. By permission.
22. F. W. Dillistone, *The Holy Spirit in the Life of Today* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957), p. 47.
23. Gordon Allport, in Introduction to Kurt Lewin's *Resolving Social Conflict* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948), p. viii.
24. *The Saving Person* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), p. 114.
25. R. B. Hoyle, "Spirit, (Holy) Spirit of God," *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* Vol. XI, p. 794.
26. Kurt Lewin, *Resolving Social Conflicts,* G. W. Lewin, ed. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948), pp. 122-123.
27. *Ibid.,* p. 123.
28. *Ibid.,* p. 103.

29. See Kurt Lewin, *A Dynamic Theory of Personality* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1935), pp. 56-57.
30. Seward Hiltner, *op. cit.*, p. 292.
31. John Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Book III, Chap. ii, par. 18 and 21.
32. *Ibid.*
33. R. B. Hoyle, *op. cit.*, p. 793.
34. *A Dynamic Theory of Personality, op. cit.*, p. 90.
35. Albert Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1955), p. 3.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 79.
38. Martin Luther, *Works, op. cit.*, p. 73.
39. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, Chap. xxii, 4.

One God and Christian Selfhood

> "Which commandment is the first of all?" Jesus answered, "The first is, 'Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one; and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength.' The second is this, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' There is no other commandment greater than these" (Mark 12-28a-31).

> He who does not love does not know God; for God is love. In this the love of God was made manifest among us, that God sent his only Son into the world, so that we might live through him (I John 4:8-9).

> Let a man be what he may, he is still to be loved, because God is loved.[1]

We have discussed the Incarnation, the Anointing, and the Resurrection of Jesus Christ in terms of their focal power in the forgiveness of sins, the calling of man in vocation, and the destiny he has in Christ. We have discussed the work of the Holy Spirit in the continuing pilgrimage of the development of the self. A central theological problem in relation to the Christian understanding of God and the self, however, has been implicit in all that has been said thus far. The Christian revelation of God

170

in Christ came to man in the matrix of the Hebrew faith. For a considerable time of its most volatile vitality, the Christian community simply assumed its own experience as valid without reflecting too much upon the theological problems which were occasioned by its new encounter with God in Christ. Its members moved existentially and without speculation. This does not mean that they moved naïvely or uncritically. It does mean that the more philosophical dimensions of their faith in God necessarily came somewhat later. As the followers of Christ confronted the questions of the Jews and the Greeks, they were forced by these questions to think theologically and to arrive at an explanation of their faith.

The first issue they faced was the relationship between the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses, and the prophets, on the one hand, and the resurrected Christ on the other hand. They had a Hebrew heritage of superb monotheism. Yet they were asserting that Christ was God. This precipitated several issues which need to be considered in this chapter: First, what did the early Christians decide to do with their heritage of monotheism? Second, in what ways was their decision relevant for their calling as Christian persons? Third, for the purposes of this study, what were and are the psychological dimensions of their new understanding of God? Another way of asking it is, wherein did and does the Christian experience of the oneness of God differ in the kind of selfhood it produces?

The Legacy of Hebrew Monotheism

The one God whom Jesus revealed was and is the same God of whom Moses taught. God had previously demonstrated his love and his ability to effect his will among

men in his dramatic encounter with Moses. He revealed his love by "hearing the cries" of his people; he demonstrated his power when he delivered them out of the bondage of Egypt and again and again out of the bondage of their idolatry. In the Old Testament as well as the New, the parently love of God as father brings into being and to maturity the selfhood of his anointed ones as he participates in their history, as he calls men in the midst of their unmade lives, and as he nourishes their destiny in a covenant of hope and faithful trust.

The call to identity and selfhood in Moses' prophetic awareness vividly illustrates the creation of true selfhood in Moses as he responded with his whole being in his encounter with Yahweh. God brought to Moses' remembrance a full awareness of his history and of God's participation in that history. Yahweh identified himself with Moses' forebears: "I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Exodus 3:6). He reawakened Moses' awareness of the oppression of the people of Israel by revealing his, Yahweh's, loving compassion for those in bondage: "I have seen the affliction of my people who are in Egypt, and have heard their cry because of their taskmasters." Furthermore, Yahweh purposed to demonstrate his effectual will in history: "I have come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians . . ." (Exodus 3:7-8). Through his identity with Moses' own parents and the parent-figures of Israel—Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—and through his creative compassion for justice and freedom of his people, Yahweh confronted Moses with his calling. This confrontation required a decision: "Come, I will send you to Pharaoh that you may bring forth my people, the sons

of Israel, out of Egypt" (Exodus 3:10). The question decisively focused Moses' mind and actualized his own selfhood. From then on he was called into wholehearted commitment to love God and his neighbors in their bondage to Pharaoh, to wrestle with them in their conflict with their own appetites and their idols. The love with which God encountered him in calling involved risk in his mission to those who were in bondage. In Calvin's phrase, it could be said of Moses: "Let Israel be what they may, they are still to be loved, because God is loved." The decisive encounter with the Holy One of Israel had brought into being a selfhood in Moses who hitherto could express his loyalty to his people only by killing one of their many oppressors.

This was not the end but only the beginning of the revelation, namely, the shaking of the foundations of Moses' placid existence in the confrontation at Horeb, the mountain of God. For Moses would not have any key to his own history, calling, and destiny apart from a clear awareness of who in deed and in fact his God is. His basic question was "What shall I say to the people of Israel when they ask me the name of the God of their fathers?" Then it was that "God said to Moses, 'I AM WHO I AM'" (Exodus 3:14). Here we do not have the strange envisaging of God as an abstract stuff characteristic of the Neoplatonists. Rather, we are confronted by one who is "absolute reality itself, the living Being *par excellence*, who communicates himself and makes himself to be known to man *in history*." He makes himself to be known in the "thrown situation" of man's bondage to himself and his own kind. God makes himself known in his creation of the crisis of calling which makes a man ask

who he and his God really are. Thus the Hebrew understanding of the One God, Yahweh, is "inseparable from the one of *personality*." As Vuilleumier says, "Yahweh did not say to Moses in the midst of the burning bush: 'I am *the one* who is,' but: 'I am *who* I am.'" [2]

Cassirer, in a much more recent study than that of Vuilleumier, suggests that the beginnings of this kind of monotheism appear in the early Egyptian texts, also. He tells us that in the midst of the Egyptian pantheon was a "hidden" God, usually referred to in the inscriptions as *the One*. This God was thought of as the originator, creator, unbegotten, beginning. Cassirer quotes the excerpts and translations from the inscriptions published by Brugsch in his *Religion und Mythologie der Alten Aegypter:* God "Is from the beginning"; "Is from the first"; "everything that is, became after he was." Then Cassirer says that it is only a step from this to true monotheism. "This step is accomplished as soon as the unity which so far has been sought through the objective world, and expressed in objective terms, is turned into a subjective essence, and *the meaning of divinity is approached not through the existence of things, but through the being of the Person, the Self.* [Italics mine] [3] Monotheism is perfected when "the only 'name' for the God is the name of the Self." Hence, the pervasive and almost universal importance today in both theology and psychology of the Jewish theologian, Martin Buber. He emphasizes the I-Thou relationship as being central in the dialogue both between man and man and between man and God. This communion is consummately real in the love, power, and justice which God is and which he expects of us in our relationship to him and our neighbor. Yet

Buber sees no need for a mediator in this pure I-Thou encounter.[4]

The One God reveals himself in the First Person, as Richard Niebuhr suggests is imperative. This is no less a disclosure, as both Vuilleumier and Niebuhr aver, of "the essence of objective being than the demonstration" to free selves as "the oneness of a self," a "faithfulness that keeps promises, is indefectible in loyalty, is truthful in freedom." This one God is neither male nor female, but makes man in his image, male and female. He is neither coextensive with his creation nor abstracted from his creation. He does not interpose nature between himself and man as impersonal law, but interposes man between himself and nature as both finite and infinite in his destiny to "have dominion" over nature and to be responsibly related to his Creator in his work. He addresses himself in covenant with man, and approaches man with initiative as a "promise-making, promise-keeping, promise-breaking being, a man of faith." [5]

Sigmund Freud, all the while insisting that Moses brought monotheism from Egypt and that Moses was actually an Egyptian, explains the origin of the Hebrew faith in the one God as a return of the repressed need of the people of Israel for "the one and only father deity whose power is unlimited." He considers this need to have been split off from the consciousness by reason of their sense of guilt over having destroyed the father of the primeval group.[6] Through this process the "divided Ego—divided by the trauma—[endeavors to reconcile] with the rest and to unite it into a stronger whole that will be fit to cope with the outer world." [7] Freud explains the rise of the Christian faith by giving Paul the place of Moses with

the Christians. Paul did not, says Freud, gloss over the original sin, the crime of having killed the father. Rather, he taught that reconciliation within the self of man could not be brought about except by the death penalty for the crime. "Death had come into the world through original sin. In reality this crime, deserving of death, had been the murder of the Father who was later deified." This deification was, Freud assumes, the beginning of monotheism as taught by Moses.[8] Later, in Christianity, not only was the need for one Father-God returned from the repressed; the sinfulness of the act that removed him in the first place was focused for the consciousness of mankind, and forgiveness made available upon a decision of faith in the death of Christ. Freud says, "Paul, by developing the Jewish religion further, became its destroyer. . . . From now on, the Jewish religion was, so to speak, a fossil." [9]

Freud plunges through historically thin ice when he talks about the supposed murder of the father who was later deified in Jewry. We have no evidence in the records but that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses all four lived to an uncommonly old age and died natural deaths. If this is what Freud means by "fathers," he is more influenced by W. Robertson Smith and Dostoyevsky here than he is by the Old Testament. Furthermore, the fact remains also that Paul was rejected by the Christians for nearly two decades during some of the most crucial years of the formation of their teachings. Antioch was a thriving rival church of Jerusalem when Paul was finally set apart for Christian leadership. Then he had the recommendation of the more influential Christian, Barnabas. Nevertheless, Freud does accent both the Hebrew and the Christian struggle for a clear understanding and acceptance of self-

hood through atonement and forgiveness. Furthermore, he is sensitive to the Christian encounter of their Hebrew legacy of monotheism in the psychology of selfhood when he says that Christianity was "no longer strictly monotheistic."

The proclamation of Christ, as God, reopened afresh the question of the oneness of God. Early Christians were liable to the criticisms from their neighbors that they were polytheists. Gregory of Nyssa's treatise on *Not Three Gods* was aimed at such accusations. The early Christians steered a hard course between the Scylla of the rigid monotheism of Judaism and the Charybdis of the lush polytheism of the Graeco-Roman world. They declared that Jesus was Christ God ". . . manifested in the flesh, vindicated in the Spirit, seen by angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, taken up in glory" (I Timothy 3:16). They nevertheless had already said that even though "an intermediary implies more than one . . . God is one" (Galatians 3:20). Thus they maintained historical rootage in their Hebrew heritage of the worship of the Lord beside whom there is no other. But in Jesus Christ, this same God who hid himself had now revealed himself completely. (Compare Isaiah 45:5, 15 and Hebrews 1:1 ff.) His essential Being of love-in-itself became the basis for their witness to his oneness, to his disclosure of himself in Christ and to his continuing ministry through the Holy Spirit.

Therefore, when we ask the question: "What did the Christian church decide to do with its heritage of Hebrew monotheism?", the answer is that they held firmly to it. They chose to cleave to their heritage and to reinterpret their history of faith in the One God from the perspective

of the revelation of this God in Christ. Thus the monotheism of the Hebrews underwent a vital transformation of meaning. This transformation poses the next question for consideration: "In what ways was the decision of the Christian community to cleave to belief in the Holy One of Israel relevant for their calling as Christians?"

One God and the Christian Calling

A Decisive Encounter. The decisiveness of the encounter of God with man in Christ rests in the oneness of Christ with God. The high-priestly prayer of Jesus as portrayed by the Fourth Gospel catches the singularity of the interrelationship of Jesus, the Father, and the disciples: "I do not pray for these only, but also for those who are to believe through their word, that they may be all one; even as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be in us so that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. The glory which thou hast given me I have given them, that they may be one even as we are one." The confrontation of Jesus Christ *is* the encounter with God.

The Locus of Decision. Not only the decisiveness of the encounter of God in Christ rests upon the oneness of God with Christ, but also the character and locus of man's religious decision itself hinges upon the integrity and oneness of the relationship between God and man in Christ. If there were two, three, four or more Gods, man would be put in the position of choosing between them. The locus of decision as to *who God really is* would rest entirely in the selfhood of man. He would be in the position to choose among the gods on the basis of his desire, predilection, or one-sided motivation. This indeed leaves the self at the mercy of itself with no objective referent or center of trans-

cendent worship and loyalty. But the Christian faith does not leave the choice to man as to who God really is, only as to whom *he* will serve as God. The initiative and locus of decision as to who God is is not in man's hands. We are the sheep of his pasture, and it is he that has made us and not we ourselves. Consequently, Marcionism as a heresy which amputated the God of the Old Testament from continuity with the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ was rightly rejected. Capitulation to this dichotomy would have been to set in motion a process of self-elevated thinking which would have sanctioned the idolatry of personal choice from a pantheon of gods. Hence the Christian faith resolutely moved in the direction of what Richard Niebuhr has called *radical monotheism.*

"For radical monotheism," Niebuhr says, "the value center is the principle of being itself; its reference is to no one reality among the many, but to the One above all the many, whence all the many derive their being, and by participation in which they exist. As faith, it is reliance on the source of all being for the significance of the self and all that exists." [10] The choice as to who we shall be is decisively in the hands of man who is free. But the decision as to who God is, is not located in man's power to choose. As Niebuhr again says, "Mankind does not find the unifying center within itself any more than any individual person does." [11] The end result of a polytheistic or even a nonradical kind of monotheism may be a "kind of religious Narcissism whereby we make ourselves the most admired of all beings . . . the self becomes the center of value and at the same time the being which is to guarantee its own life against meaninglessness and worthlessness, and the threat of frustration." [12]

Other Kinds of Monotheism. The radical monotheism of which Niebuhr speaks needs comparison with other kinds of monotheism. Radical monotheism refers to the worship of one God who does not exclude from the sphere of value any realm of being but includes the "realm of being in its wholeness." [13] Even one's enemy is included in one's love because God is all inclusive in his love. Josiah Royce identified this as *ethical monotheism,* as distinguished from the phlosophical monotheism of the Hellenists who perceived God as the source, explanation, correlate, order, and reasonableness of the world. Or, as Royce further distinguishes it, ethical monotheism is contrasted with Indic or mystical monotheism which insists upon the sole reality of God and the unreality of the world. This is another way of describing pantheism. As we shall see later, all three of these have participated in the Western Christian tradition but the centrality of ethical monotheism has been predominant. Monotheism characteristic of the Hebrew prophets, Jesus, and the apostles was essentially radical in nature, including male and female, Jew and Gentile, bond and free, life and death in the sovereign rule of God. Man encountered this God, and there was and is no other.[14] He can take none of his roles—whether these roles be sex, parenthood, race, nation, creed, or (more contemporaneously) profession—as a self-definition of idolatry whereby others might be excluded. This God is no respecter of persons; and Jesus commands that we be all-inclusive in our love, as God is all-inclusive in his love. To this the Christian man is called in the one God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The Unity of God, the Love of Neighbor, and the Love of Self. The summation of the Law in the two command-

ments to love God with one's whole being and one's neigh-
bor as oneself was firmly established in the teaching of
Jesus and the witness of the early church in the ethical
monotheism of the prophetic version of the Law in Deuter-
onomy. The calling of man is to the love of God and neigh-
bor. God is love. We are to love him wholeheartedly and
not with one or more parts of our being. This is an en-
counter of the one God and the loving self. God is en-
countered in Jesus Christ as the Being-of-Love itself. Jesus
gathers up the whole of the Hebrew heritage of the wor-
ship of the Holy of Israel, and the love of neighbor as one
loves his very life.

But the Christian calling does not stop here, for in the
Incarnation, Crucifixion, and Resurrection the full exegesis
of Love is articulate and unmistakable. The love of neigh-
bor *as oneself* does not take narcissistic self-idolatry as its
prudential point of reference. Far from it. The Christian
has taken up his cross and followed the Lord Jesus Christ.
This is *how* he loves himself. This is his calling. Therefore,
he loves his neighbor as Christ loved him and gave himself
for him. The wife reveres her husband, but the husband
loves his wife as Christ loved the church and gave himself
for it. This is the new commandment of Christ's love. This
is the basis for self-respect, outside the pride and self-
elevation of man. This is the criterion of the covenantal
relationship of the Christian to God and his neighbor, who
well may be his enemy, but is a "person for whom Christ
died." The self of love is not only unified in the worship of
the one God, but is expanded to encompass all mankind,
even one's enemies.

The radical difference between the pure, hard, and un-
differentiated monotheism of Judaism and the diverse,

grace-giving, and incarnate monotheism of Christianity rests in Jesus' having taken the universal implications of faith in God to its ultimate in the love that he showed to all manner of men. At the same time he required of them singlehearted devotion to the Heavenly Father. But this rests in turn upon the transformation of tragedy which his Resurrection represents. He revealed both the seriousness with which God takes sin and the power which God demonstrates in the life committed to him in faithful trust, singleness of heart, and sincerity of covenant. The qualitatively serious kind of monotheism which Jesus Christ brought home to men speaks definitively to a psychology of Christian loyalty and selfhood in ways which need careful discussion here.

Some Psychological Aspects of Monotheism and Christian Selfhood

The relevance of what has been thus far said for a psychology of Christian loyalty and selfhood is largely an unexplored domain. Adolph Harnack says that "we are still, unfortunately, without any investigation of the importance of monotheism for psychology." [15] Such an investigation necessarily will need to be an interdisciplinary research between theologians, anthropologists, and psychologists. However, a suggestive pattern for such a research would, it seems, call for intensive exploration of the following areas of concern. These areas of concern can be discussed suggestively here but need the detailed inquiry of such an interdisciplinary team.

Polytheism and Selfhood. First, the kind of personal selfhood which emerges amid an explicitly polytheistic culture needs clinical description and theological analysis. For ex-

ample, several hunches can be stated with the clear under-
standing that this is exactly what these statements are:
hunches. For instance, Delitsch challenged the commonly
accepted truism that Israelitish monotheism produced an
ethical consciousness and standard of morality superior to
that of Babylonian polytheism. He based his opinions upon
the careful comparison of sacred writings of the two cul-
tures. But he succeeded only in pointing out the haz-
ardousness of the attempt "to prove the superiority of
Israelitish religion and ethics to Babylonian." Finkelstein
says that "a monotheistic religion by virtue of its inherent
characteristics tends . . . to become an ethical religion."
Finkelstein draws a conclusion, however, which is relevant
for a psychology of Christian selfhood. He says that the
concept of an agreement or a covenant "guaranteeing"
divine favor, forgiveness, and consistent promise is "com-
pletely foreign to a polytheistic system." Polytheism is
characterized by a capricious lack of consistency and the
ethical leadership of the worship is always a pragmatic,
ad hoc kind of leadership.[16]

This hunch of Finkelstein could be explored psycho-
logically by studying two contrasting cultures of today on
a comparative basis, one where monotheism is deeply
rooted in the culture as compared with a culture where
polytheism is in a relatively intact state. But further psy-
chological observation can be made from this vantage
point, even so. The aesthetic category of Sören Kierkegaard
is helpful. In a polytheistic culture, the likelihood of the
self becoming focused in decisions, either ethically or in
worship, would be less certain than in a monotheistic faith.
The individual when frustrated in his desires by one god,
it seems, would tend to "shop" the other gods for his own

caprice. Indecisiveness, a disregard for the eschatological aspects of time, and a generally aesthetic existence would be more likely to prevail. Even within a nominally mono-theistic culture, such as our own, the vast pluralism of our value systems, neatly compartmentalized from each other, indicates how shallowly our belief in one God roots. To quote Niebuhr again, "Our inner conflicts seem due to the fact that we have many sources of value, and that these cannot all be served." [17]

Jesus taught that a man cannot serve God and mammon. The whole Sermon on the Mount clarifies the psychological problem of the inner adulteration of men's motives, the fracturing of their perceptual field, and the competitive value structures which disperse and threaten their whole existence. Singleness of heart, purity of heart, clarity of the vision of God, love of neighbor, and stability of the founda-tions of life—all these were the psychic fruits of the de-cisive commitment in covenant to the worship of one God who is all-inclusive, universal, and no respecter of persons. The psychology of loyalty is rooted in the reality of a trust-worthy covenant. A trustworthy covenant implies the kind of God who both loves and chooses to make a covenant with his people, and who, upon having made this covenant, is powerful to maintain it in justice and love, that is, with compassionate consistency. Then, if Finkelstein's hypothe-sis is right, the worship of one God becomes decisive in the integration of the self of man.

Other Kinds of Monotheism and Selfhood. The second psychological aspect of monotheism for Christian selfhood begins just at the point where Finkelstein leaves off, how-ever. Not only do we necessarily ask questions about the difference between the selfhood of the polytheist and the

monotheist. We must also recognize that not all monotheists are alike. We must, for example, distinguish between the ethical monotheism of the Hebrew-Christian tradition on the one hand and the Greek and Indic kinds of monotheism on the other hand, to follow Royce's classification. Contemporary culture seems to have gone, for instance, more in the direction of the Greek conception of monotheism than we would like to admit. We look upon the belief in one God as the source, correlation, and explanation of the reasonableness of the world. The natural order of things in marriage, vocation, stewardship of our goods, education, and the conduct of political affairs, we keep neatly separated from "religion." As a result we have a pragmatic, *ad hoc* kind of ethical inconsistency that may meet each given situation but has little reference to a covenant with the God whom we worship. When things become ambiguous, unreasonable, and filled with the darkness of mystery, we tend to "lose our faith" and become "atheists." At least our faith is shaken. Little wonder is it that we are "modern men in search of a soul," on a "quest for identity," and so on. The diffusion of the identity and the lack of clear selfhood may be that our culture and the individuals within it are more pluralistic and even polytheistic than we want to admit. The advantage that the Greeks had was that their pantheon, even, was more specific than ours. Each god, save the Unknown God, had a name. All the while they had a rational and philosophical tenet of belief in one God.

Such theoretical and practical polytheism has specific psychopathological reference. Some exploratory research has been done, and now confirmatory research is indicated to draw exact parallels between the collapse of idolatrous

value structures and the psychoreligious factors in mental illness. From an historical point of view, McCasland and others have raised the question of the correlation between polytheism and demon-possession. From a clinical pastoral point of view, Stinnette and Oates have both tentatively hypothesized idolatory and multiple conflicting loyalties as the major religious factors in mental illness. But the disturbing part of the latter research is that it has been done in the context of nominally Christian monotheistic culture. Yet the findings point to real idolatrous constructions in mental patients.

Furthermore, the comparison between the Indic or mystical kind of monotheism and the radical monotheism of which Niebuhr speaks has psychological significance for Christian selfhood. The monotheism which equates God with the All and denies the reality of the world moves away from, rather than toward, the definition of the selfhood of man, it seems. The self is absorbed rather than clarified. Yet, the mystical consciousness, instead of heightening the I-Thou relationship between man and God, encompasses them in each other. The relationship between the Creator and the creature is destroyed, not just blurred. Yet this kind of monotheism has served as a sort of "negative theology" which rejects all speculation and abstraction and calls "for an immediate vision of God (which) leads to an insight which no practical activity, however righteous, attains." [18]

Judaistic Monotheism and Selfhood. But the main strain between kinds of monotheism is between the hard and unbending monotheism of Judaism and the more flexible and accepting kind of monotheism which the Christian revelation has historically espoused. Robert E. Fitch, in

a lively debate with a Jewish theologian, calls the Jewish rejection of the Incarnation a defensive attempt to maintain a "pure monotheism" and cuts the line of communication between Jew and Christian. But he insists that Christians and Jews have a bond between them in their common persuasion of ethical monotheism, which he identifies with the prophets.[19] Yet one asks whether Fitch's effort to develop a better relationship between Jews and Christians kept him from drawing a connection between the pure monotheism and a hard unrelentingness in God. A pure monotheism, says Fitch, "usually converts God into some kind of monster who bears a closer resemblance to a devil than a deity." [20] This is an overstatement, it seems, and would bear empirical investigation. Similarly a hypothesis, to the effect that pure, "hard," or undifferentiated monotheism results in a legalistic relationship to the worshiper who is expected to earn his salvation by the sweat of his own attempts to be righteous, could be fruitfully studied. One asks: Why is it that rigid monotheism has tended to develop forensic systems of legal righteousness? Furthermore, the more aggressive, domineering, and pseudomasculine characteristics tend to be elevated to the point of a "taboo on tenderness," a paranoid fear of intimacy, and an elevation of raw power to the height of value.

For example, even within Christianity we note this kind of theoretical model of Christian selfhood emerging when one person of the Trinity becomes for all practical purposes the One, almost to the elimination and exclusion of the other two persons. For instance, in Pentecostalism, the Holy Spirit is so elevated. In the harder forms of Puritanism, the Sovereign Father was evident to the exclusion of

the tutelage of the Holy Spirit and the compassion of the Son. New England witches were usually women, and a hard unbending respect for the Devil made almost a god of him. More recently, the hyperliberal elevation of the "Jesus of History" to the exclusion of the identity of the Father and the work of the Holy Spirit made the teachings of Jesus another, not a new, Torah. Similarly, mechanical and transactional interpretations of the atonement in pietistic denominations have made a hard legalism of "getting saved."

The Christian of today cannot look with disdain at a Jew and lay all legalism at his door. Nor can we impute all the distortion of selfhood in hard and pure monotheism to the Jew. Christians, too, have a history of having taken the rich, diversified, and vitally whole revelation of God as Father, as Son, and as Holy Spirit in the life, death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ and having turned it into a monolithic legalism. It is one thing to declare monarchianism, monophysitism, unitarianism, pentecostalism, modernism, pietism, and Christian Science as heresies, "fringe groups," or splinter movements. It is a more effective thing to develop a church theology and practice which moves upon the whole counsel of God in the differentiated Oneness of the Triune God. The results of our "one-sidedness" in response to the wholeness of the self-impartation of God in Christ show in the bondage of the self, both individually and collectively, to the legalism of pure, undifferentiated monotheism.

Christian Monotheism and Selfhood. To the contrary the inner diversity of the distinctly Christian form of radical monotheism should and—when taken with wholeness of faith by man—does produce a qualitatively different

kind of selfhood. The New Testament speaks most clearly on this in Paul's letter to the Galatians. Jesus Christ was "publicly portrayed as crucified" before the eyes of the Galatians. They received the Holy Spirit by hearing with faith, not by the works of the law. God himself, as was true in Abraham's case, justified them by faith and blessed them with Abraham (Galatians 3:1-10). In Jesus Christ they are no longer under the custodianship of the law. Paul says, "In Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith." Nevertheless, in Christ they are Abraham's off-spring, participating in the same covenant of promise. This worship of the God of Abraham and the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ brings freedom; for freedom Christ had set them free. This worship is inclusive of all manner of selves: Jews and Greeks, slaves and free men, men and women. All these temporal foci of selfhood are transcended in the ultimate and all-inclusive selfhood that Christ offers to the sons of God (Galatians 3:23-29). In this all-embracing encounter, the history, calling, and destiny of the selfhood of the Christian are made richly certain in their belonging to God and to each other in Christ. They are to walk in the Spirit and to live as participants in the eternal, not as idolaters of the flesh. The fruits of the walk in the Spirit are: "love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control." This life is the antithesis of the law, "for against such there is no law" (Galatians 5:22-23).

This encounter of God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit accomplishes several inner results for the individual person against the background of his community. First, the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus clearly portrays before man's very eyes the cancellation of the law by this

supreme act of love. The life of faith itself is not only demonstrated before man's eyes; the power of faith is thereby released to man himself. Second, the Incarnation of God in Christ brings to man the freedom as a self of what D. M. Baillie calls "the paradox of grace." This paradox ascribes the glory to God for anything good in us but does not destroy our freedom as selves. The reverse is true, as Baillie says: "our actions are never more truly free and personal and human, they are never more truly our own, than when they are wrought in us by God. But the whole experience of this paradox, which covers only those fragments of our lives in which there is something good, has come into our lives through One in whom it covered the whole of His life, so that His life was the very life of God Himself, and yet was at the same time in the fullest sense the life of a man. Jesus Christ is the One in whom selfhood fully came to its own and lived its fullest life, as human life ought to be lived, because His human selfhood was wholly yielded to God, so that His whole life was the life of God incarnate. That was the one life which was wholly divine and wholly human. He lived His life in such a way that it was the life of God incarnate; but also, since the initiative is always with God, He lived it as He did because it was the life of God incarnate. And thus through Him there came to those who knew Him a new revelation of God." [21]

The paradox of grace that resides in the more differentiated monotheism of the Christian Incarnation effects a redemptive change in man's selfhood which can be effected in no other way. This change takes place at the focus of his awareness of his personal identity at the point of decision. Pure, undifferentiated monotheism issued in

hard legalism. Men in suspended animation waited until God would in due time reveal, not just the Law, but himself. Meanwhile, the locus of decision as to the selfhood and identity of the pious Jew was left in the Jew's own capacity to keep the law. His selfhood was stillborn as an ethical fetus. The Apostle Paul put it another way: he was left as an undeveloped child at the hands of a tutor who could get him only so far. This was also the dilemma of Martin Luther as he continued to return to Staupitz for reassurance upon confessing again and again the minutiae of the law. This kind of thing happens today when means of therapy such as psychoanalysis become, not just a means of therapy for sick persons, but a way of salvation in which both the sick and the responsible trust. They return again and again to "analysis" always hoping for an inner revelation of redemption.

From this vantage point Sören Kierkegaard vividly portrays the Christian problems of "becoming a self." He sets forth the edification and awakening of the self as both a Christian and a psychologist. He says that "every man is primitively planned to be a self, appointed to become oneself. . . ." [22] He says further that "thus it is eternity must act, because to have a self, to be a self, is the greatest concession made to man, but at the same time it is eternity's demand upon him." [23] Then he defines the faith relationship by saying that "faith is: That the self in being itself and willing to be itself is grounded transparently in God." [24] But this intention to be or not to be a self may be arrested at the aesthetic level of existence. If so, desire and indecisive suspension of animation characterize the person who has never willed to be a self. Or, the decision of faith may be at an ethical level in which the person

wills to become a self, but the legal demands thrust him in despair for having done so. The demands of selfhood are experienced legally, and duty thrusts the self into despair. This despair thrusts the self into face-to-face relationship to Christ.

Such a self, face to face with Christ, "is a self potentiated by the prodigious concession of God . . . that God also for the sake of this self let Himself to be born, became man, suffered, died. As was said in the foregoing, 'the more conception of God, the more self,' so here it is true that the more conception of Christ, the more self. A self is qualitatively what its measure is. That Christ is the measure on God's part attested as the expression for the immense reality a self possesses; for it is true for the first time in Christ that God is man's goal and measure, or measure and goal. —But the more self, the more intense the sin." [25] Yet, this focusing of our awareness as history, calling, and destiny amid the inescapability of our sin does not leave us in despair as selves before God. Rather, if our hearts condemn us, God is greater than our hearts and has demonstrated that greatness in the love he has shown to us in Jesus Christ. The loving self is born out of this encounter and sustained by him who brought us out of a dead sonship in sin to a live sonship and lively hope in Jesus Christ.

Therefore, Christian monotheism differs radically in the inner content of the I-Thou encounter from the Jewish monotheism of Martin Buber. The relationship between God and man in the Christian faith is not *just* a simple, one-to-one, I-Thou encounter. Neither the inner being of God is simple nor is the inner identity of man uncomplex. The Christian faith recognizes and finds in Christ the

answer to the inherent need for a Mediator between God and man, as we saw in the discussion of the Incarnation and man's encounter with his history of sin. The communityness of the Godhead as interpreted in the Christian faith comes realistically to grips with this need for the God-man as Mediator.[26] Yet this very recognition is a stumbling block to the Jew. As Fitch says, the Torah is a stumbling block to the Christian and the Christ is a stumbling block to the Jew.

The self in Christ is continually sustained in his freedom from the law and in the loneliness of his calling through the companionship of the Holy Spirit. Professor Whitehead described the process of religion as "the transition from God the void to God the enemy, and from God the enemy to God the companion." [27] The Hebrew prophets caught vast vistas of this vision of God as companion. The Incarnation of God in Christ is the fullness of this revelation. But even the Christ saw the necessity of his "going away" in order that both he and the Father might "come again" in the gift of the Holy Spirit. One might ask concerning the Christian faith: "Is this not a brother religion in which the younger brothers have conspired with the elder brother, Jesus, to rebel against the Enemy Father?" The answer to this is in the oneness of the Son and the Father, accessible to man in the Holy Spirit. Both of them, Father and Son, have entered a benevolent covenant with us as companion and friend in the Holy Spirit. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit also challenges effectively the criticism that the need for Christ indicates a dependency in us that refuses to come to terms with the "father" or authority figures. Even in the earthly parent-child relationship the child who grows up has to accept

himself as an adult in relationship to another adult, namely his father and/or mother. He cannot forever "use" his rebellion against them as an excuse for refusing to relate to all authority figures on a man-to-man basis of true comradeship and adult communion. Nor can he continue to "use" his parents as punching bags and to overlook the fact that they are persons in their own right and not means to his rebellion. This is the other side of the coin of parental authority. One assumes in saying this that parents have the obverse adjustment to make when the child is no longer a child, but has become a man in his own right.

In relationship to God, the self, correspondingly, is not genuinely actualized so long as the *ipso facto* equation with parental authority remains. God the Father broke this equation in the Hebrew prophets again and again. He said to Ezekiel: "Son of man, stand upon your feet, and I will speak with you" (Ezekiel 2:1). The Spirit of God entered Ezekiel and enabled him to converse *with* God as friend and companion, not as enemy. The gift of the Holy Spirit upon the request of the Son makes the continuing relationship of Christ and the Father one of freedom and *inter*dependence *with* man. This is neither rebellion nor dependency in the servile sense of the law. The Spirit gives freedom and life, but the law gives bondage and death.

Psychoanalytic criticisms of Christianity are implicit in the questions which have been faced here. One must recognize them as legitimate criticisms of those kinds of legalism which have emerged within orthodox Christianity where a hard monotheism has been made of one or the other persons of the Trinity. Even the Pentecostal and pietistic emphases upon the "gift of the Holy Spirit" or

the "act of conversion" apart from the free communion in the wholeness of Godhead—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit —produce the same kind of death-dealing legalism as did Judaism. Here the relationship is either one of compulsive dependency or compulsive rebellion, both of which are forms of bondage to the law.

Monotheism and Selfhood in Christian Marriage. A final constellation of problems associated with the psychological significance of monotheism revolves around the calling of man as a sexual being and the health of man as a total being. The Protestant principle of the sovereignty of God precludes man's making sex the central value of his life. This is idolatry and it is not coincidental that much of polytheism has gone in the direction of fertility-cultism and worship of the procreative events of life. Yet this is a negative kind of statement, of value in itself but strongly in need of creative exploration of the positive relationship of the sexes in the worship of one God. The Genesis account described the creation of man in the image of God, "male and female created he them." The meaning of marriage, both Hebrew and Christian, is the *henosis* of selfhood in what is biblically symbolized in the asunderlessness of the "one flesh" except by death. This *henosis* is actualized in the life of a child born of this union. The theological question is: "Wherein is the worship of one God relevant to this?" The psychological question is: "Wherein does our selfhood in marriage portray the inner identity of the image of God?"

The oneness of the relation of man and woman symbolizes the transcendence of God in Christ over the distinction between the sexes. God is neither male nor female

to the exclusion of the other. A person does not have access to nor is denied that access by God because of his or her sex. In Christ, there is neither male nor female. In the Resurrection, there is neither marriage nor giving in marriage. Yet, in this regard, both the paternal and the maternal dimensions of human existence are symbolically attributed to God in the biblical witness of his oneness. We are accustomed to the paternal references, but Isaiah depicts God as a mother comforting Jerusalem (Isaiah 66:13), and Jesus says that he yearns over Jerusalem as a mother hen does over her brood (Matthew 23:37-39). The principles of shepherdly compassion and of disciplinary confrontation both abide in the love and the mercy of the Holy One of Israel as Isaiah depicts him, and in the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. The maternal dimensions of caring and the paternal aspects of challenge inhere in the very character of God in a mysterious harmony, consistency, and oneness. This is not a oneness of sameness, but a oneness of harmony and reconciliation.

In turn, this is the intention of God in the relationship of husband and wife to child, as parents. The husband brings the principles of leadership and demand to the relationship; the wife brings the principles of tenderness and gift to the situation. In the mystery of love and marriage each receives his or her basic lack from the other, interfusing and completing the selfhood of the other with the gift of his or her being in God. The wife becomes more resolute, more decisive, and can exercise leadership; the husband becomes more considerate, more compassionate and loses his shyness and taboos about tenderness. The Holy Spirit both enables them to be effective teachers of

each other and, in humility, to learn from each other. Together, they bring a harmonious, consistent, and yet richly diverse counsel to the life of the child. The child, in more than just its physical characteristics partakes of both the feminine and the masculine dimensions of life as his parents communicate their identity to him. This seems to be at least the outer contour of the mystery of love and marriage.[28]

But the idolatrous possibility of sexuality for fragmenting the personality and destroying the integrity of the self is clearly explicated in the Bible. Otto Piper says, "The Bible sounds a warning against the idealistic fallacy which expects all of life's meaning from love and sex. The sin of David, although it had violated another man's life and the wife of the man also, was "against God and God only," as the 51st Psalm interprets it. The lust after a woman not one's wife is the rising up of a part of the being against the totality of the life. The whole is in such danger of destruction that it would be better that the part of life represented in sex be dealt with surgically than that the whole life perish. In other words, it is better that a person be a total ascetic than an idolater of sex. But in Christian marriage this is not necessary. The human relationship of marriage provides for the sexual needs of man at the same time the command that we have no other gods before the Lord forbids idolatry. Paul has said: "For this is the will of God, your sanctification: that you abstain from immorality; that each one of you know how to take a wife for himself in holiness and honor, not in the passion of lust like the heathen who do not know God. . . . For God has not called us for uncleanness, but in holiness. Therefore,

whoever disregards this, disregards not man but God, who gives his Holy Spirit to you" (I Thessalonians 4:3 ff.).

Monotheism and Selfhood in the Wholeness of Health. The psychoanalytic movement has challenged the Christian faith at the point of its own legalism. We have said that a hard monotheism tends to result in legalism. There is a more distinctly Protestant way of saying this. When the radical monotheism of the prophets and of the Christian revolution in Judaism ceases to be taken seriously, the church, the priesthood, the movement, the social issue, or the particular branches of science are absolutized and become the matrix of a self-defensive, legalistic system. This system becomes the means of setting up an irreparable breach within the selfhood of its devotees. The other aspects of life are "secularized" and declared "unholy." As Niebuhr again points out, church and society are dissociated from each other, the laity become "unhallowed," and, one could add, those who are not of the "movement" or who are "against" the issue are denigrated. Great portions of selfhood and society are rift asunder; and repression, both personal and social, sets in. These repressed portions of being itself return in the form of health symptoms and social disorganization. The individual becomes "nervous" and the society, as Lawrence K. Frank said some time ago, becomes "the patient." Isaiah aptly describes the lack of health in us in our idolatries:

> Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity,
>   offspring of evildoers, sons who deal corruptly!
> They have forsaken the Lord,
>   they have despised the Holy One of Israel,
>   they are utterly estranged.

Why will you still be smitten, that you continue to rebel?
   The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint.
   From the sole of the foot even to the head,
   there is no soundness in it,
   but bruises and sores
      and bleeding wounds;
   they are not pressed out, or bound up,
      or softened with oil (Isaiah 1:4-6).

The health of individual or society, but particularly the individual, hinges not upon an abstract "unity" of everything but upon the integrity, the fidelity, and the thoroughgoingness with which the person meets the varied and contradictory demands of life. His difficulties in living often require illness in order to make up for the difference between the demands of life and his resourcefulness to meet these demands. Yet the heart of the matter seems to pulsate out from that which a person has decided to be *categorically* demanding in life, that which requires him to keep a promise, to give his indefectible loyalty. This promise-keeping and covenantal belonging provides the serenity and integrity that is necessary for health at its most practical levels. The integrity with which the individual lives and loves is one crucial determinant of his resistance to disease and his will to recover from disease once he has succumbed to it. Needless to say, there are points of no return in many diseases. In many others, as G. Canby Robinson early pointed out, the illness of the whole person continues far beyond the disappearance of the disease entity.

As has been previously indicated, much conflict in contemporary life revolves around the incompatibility men

feel in the various roles of life. Not the least of these incompatibilities exists between men's sense of the sacred and the secular, their absorption in work to the exclusion of their family, and their feeling that the ideals they have been taught do not apply to the lives they feel forced to live. This practical pluralism—even polytheism—pulls men asunder, destroys their integrity of selfhood.

Very briefly, then, radical monotheism calls for a radical faith which, as Niebuhr again says, "is either expressed by the self in all its roles and relations or not expressed at all." [29] But our "natural henotheism and our despairing polytheism" continue apace. The price we pay is the wholeness of self, the health of existence.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER SIX

1. John Calvin, Institutes I, Bk. II, Chap. vii, 55.
2. H. Vuilleumier, *Etude sur le Monothéisme Des Hébreux* (Paris: George Bridel, 1864), p. 26.
3. Ernst Cassirer, *Language and Myth*, Susanne Langer, tr. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1946), p. 76. By permission.
4. The dialogue of Self and self, then, becomes the ethical watershed of the great religions of the world. Greek thinkers, under something of the same kinds of influence, did not develop a thoroughgoing monotheism as did the Hebrews. Rather, they sought to arrive at the contemplative ideal through philosophical speculation about the nature of man's being, his self. Hence, we have in their writings the great treatises concerning the soul, such as may be found in Plato's *Phaedrus,* Aristotle's *De Anima,* and in the Roman Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura.* Christian apologists, as we shall see in the next chapter, encountered these Greek doctrines as they sought to interpret the Christian witness that the one true and living God of Israel had become flesh in Jesus Christ. At the same time they fell heir to the

criticism that they had turned polytheists. In this context, the Christian doctrine of the Trinity was formulated out of the living encounter of Love which Christians experienced in Christ as God Incarnate.

5. H. Richard Niebuhr, *Radical Monotheism and Western Culture* (see Note 10 below), p. 41.
6. Sigmund Freud, *Moses and Monotheism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1939), pp. 113-114.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 97.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 113.
10. H. Richard Niebuhr, *Radical Monotheism and Western Culture* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), p. 32. By permission.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 119.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 37.
14. Josiah Royce, "Monotheism," *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. VIII, p. 820.
15. Adolph Harnack, *The History of Dogma*, N. Buchanan, tr., 3rd Ed. (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1900), Vol. V, p. 107n.
16. Jacob J. Finkelstein, "Bible and Babel," *Commentary*, 26:439, Nov., 1958.
17. H. Richard Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, p. 121.
18. Royce, *op. cit.*, p. 820.
19. Robert E. Fitch, "The Bond Between Christian and Jew," *Commentary*, 17:440, May, 1954.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 441.
21. D. M. Baillie, *God Was in Christ* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), pp. 144-145. By permission.
22. Sören Kierkegaard, *The Sickness unto Death*, Walter Lowrie, tr. (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1941), p. 50.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 132.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 186.
26. *Op. cit.* (See Note 19.) For this particular insight I am indebted to Professor Daniel Day Williams in a class discussion which I was privileged to hear.
27. Alfred North Whitehead, *Religion in the Making* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926), p. 16.

28. For a more detailed discussion of the *henosis* of Christian marriage, see Derrick S. Bailey, *The Mystery of Love and Marriage* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952).

29. H. Richard Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

The Trinity and Man's Bipolar Existence

> There is . . . one God and Father of us all, who is above all and through all and in all (Ephesians 4:4-5).
>
> "You are the Christ, the Son of the Living God" (Matthew 16:16).
>
> ". . . you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 1:5).
>
> "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age" (Matthew 28:19-20).

Repeatedly the term "differentiated" has been applied to Christian monotheism. The meaning of this term can best be understood by turning full attention to the mystery of the Trinity, especially as this central Christian doctrine bespeaks the bipolar unity and diversity of the Being of God and is portrayed in his image in man. The Christian revelation of God in Christ reflects creative homogeneity and heterogeneity in the nature of both God and man. In oneness and manyness the consistency and variety of identity and selfhood in God and man are represented in the

203

Trinity. Norman Pittenger feels that the monotheism of the Christian "is enriched by the belief that in the mystery of the divine Reality there are distinctions or relationships, so that it may be properly said that sociality as well as personality are to be ascribed to deity." [1] Much can be said here, although the doctrine does also represent the mystery of the depths of God and man. By mystery, we mean that unaided reason apart from revelation cannot traverse the truth represented in the Trinity. Nor can reason cogently demonstrate the Trinity after it has been revealed. But this does not mean that the Trinity is contrary to or incompatible with reason. [2] Therefore, this discussion is no vain attempt to make perfectly lucid that which by its nature is a true mystery. Yet the discussion is imperative because theological honesty and psychological relevance require confrontation of the Triune God in the further definition and focusing of the self in Christ.

C. G. Jung, the Swiss psychotherapist, tells an impressive story concerning his "training in Christianity." His father was a pastor in the Reformed Church. Jung says, "I well remember my confirmation lesson at the hands of my own father. The catechism bored me unspeakably. Once I turned the leaves of the little book in order to find something of interest, and my glance fell on the paragraphs about the Trinity. That interested me, and I waited impatiently until the instruction advanced to that section. But when the longed-for lesson had arrived, my father said: 'We will skip this section; I cannot make anything out of it myself.' With that my last hope was laid in the grave." [3]

Many Christian pastors today, especially those who are glad to think of themselves as being "practical men," "skip" over the Trinity. They see little relevance of the

doctrine for a coherent understanding of Christian self-hood. We have tended as Christian pastors to preoccupy ourselves with the recently blossomed flowers of psychological truth. We neglect to note that for centuries before the scientific revolution trinitarian theologians were reflecting comprehensive psychological understandings in their doctrines of the Trinity. Their inquiry into the depths of God's being plunged them into a deeper knowledge of themselves. They could do this for the very reason that they were interested in the depths of life. They were not satisfied with surface estimates of either the nature of God or of themselves.

The human being is not merely a simple, behaving organism which will respond without fail if stimulated correctly. He is a remarkably complex identity yet capable of a singlehearted focus of his life in the commitment of faith. But when a contemporary pastor attempts to explore the depths of man's selfhood he finds an intricate inner-connected, diverse, and conflictual self. He learns to appreciate more the depths of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God. God, instead of being simple and lacking the dimensions of depth and diversity within his Being, is revealed to him in all the wealth of his inner variety.

The Christological Encounter and the Trinity of Experience

The earliest Christians' affirmations of the divinity of Jesus Christ as Lord sprang from the impact of his love upon them and their discovery of their true identity in their total response to him. The complicated questions which later arose were much more speculative. The early Apostolic preaching declared to the Jewish audience: "God

has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified." But the later Christians were asked: "Was he Lord and Christ from the beginning, or did God, after Jesus was raised from the dead, *make* him Lord and Christ?" "Was this an achievement of the man Jesus, that he should be made Lord and Christ?" But Paul answered apparently without any knowledge of controversy in previous years that Jesus was in the very form or nature of God himself (Philippians 2:6). And the "deposit of faith" recorded in I Timothy declares God himself to be manifested in the faith in Jesus. The Johannine Gospel declares: "The Word was made flesh."

This firm faith in the complete disclosure of God in Jesus Christ has been the heart of Christian doctrine ever since. Yet, this doctrine of God in flesh crucified became a stumbling block to the Jews and foolishness to the Greeks. The Jews could not accept, even in their most willing moments, a God who was Father and at the same time a Son. This attacked the oneness of God. The Greeks considered the flesh to be evil in and of itself. They considered the soul and body at their best to be separated from each other, and therefore could not conceive of the fusion of God and man in one person. In a word, the Jews thought the Christians were tearing God asunder and the Greeks thought they were trying to unify the soul and body of man, which by their nature could not be mixed, much less unified.

Between these two frontiers, Christian teachers fought a two-front war. They had, in Christian evangelism, experienced both the oneness and the diversity of the Godhead. They sought to explain what they had experienced in confrontation with Jesus Christ, namely, the reconcilia-

tion of themselves with God and the enjoyment of peace within and between themselves in the love which he "shed abroad" in their hearts in Christ Jesus through the Holy Spirit (Romans 5:5, KJV). On the other hand, as was seen in the last chapter, they challenged the aesthetic decisionlessness and self-exaltation of Greek and Roman empire builders by declaring that there is only one Lord and God, and that is Jesus Christ. The self is not the Lord of the universe, but is subject to its Maker. They declared both the legalism of the Jews and the lustiness of paganism in the offering of meat to idols to be "beings that by nature are no gods" (Galatians 4:8). Neither legalism nor aestheticism, antinomianism nor asceticism were substitutes for the new man in Christ who is brought into being by participation in his death, burial, and resurrection (Galatians 2:20 and Romans 6:1-14). The self that had been dead is now alive in Christ. The "I" that did live has been crucified with Christ but is *nevertheless* alive in Christ. This gospel of the "nevertheless" called for a decision both about the law and about the elevation of the self to the place of God.

The Experience of the Trinity and the Selfhood of Man in Classical Culture

It is easy to say that Greek thought is alien to the mind of Jesus and Paul. Yet this underestimates the way the power of the gospel challenged and was taken seriously by the best minds of the Graeco-Roman, classical culture. In the words of G. L. Prestige, "Hebrew theism looked to sympathetic Hellenistic minds." [4] These Hellenistic minds applied their gifts as vocation in loving response to the calling of Jesus Christ as Lord. They, too, participated in

his will for their destiny. They tried to state the Christian faith in such a way that men would, like themselves, be brought to a decision. They realized their own selfhood in losing themselves in this pursuit. Therefore, these Greeks and Romans must be looked upon as the ongoing fellowship of believers through whom God had chosen to continue his witness in Christ. They grappled with the coherent oneness of God in the face of attempts of the opponents of the Christian faith to make charges of polytheism stick. They saw in these changes a threat to the wholehearted and undivided love of God and a misunderstanding of his threefold revelation of himself as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

For example, Tertullian (circa A.D. 150-200), who, though he was a Latin lawyer, also read and wrote Greek fluently, challenged critics of the Christian faith who felt that to believe in the divine economy of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit was to open the way for the very polytheism out of which they had been born in Christ. Tertullian said of them: "They constantly accuse us of preaching two Gods, or three Gods, and take to themselves pre-eminently the credit of worshiping the one God." [5] Yet, Tertullian said the oneness of God is not violated by his sharing his power and dominion with the Son and the Spirit. Prestige again summarizes: "Tertullian's conception of divine unity . . . rests on his doctrine of the 'economy,' that the unity constitutes the triad out of its own inherent nature, not by any process of subdivision, but by reason of a principle of constructive integration which the godhead essentially possesses." [6]

Tertullian also addressed himself to the dynamic wholeness of the self of man. In his *A Treatise on the Soul*, he

called the philosophers "the patriarchs of heretics." He
located their heresy in their attempts to shatter the in-
tegrity of the human being. With a stinging sarcasm, he
said: "The fault of the divine doctrine lies, I suppose, in
its springing from Judea rather than from Greece. Christ
made a mistake in sending forth fishermen rather than
sophists." [7] He scored the philosophers for dividing the
soul into parts. Plato, he says, divides it into two, Zeno
into three, Panaetius, into five or six, Soranus into seven,
Chrysippus into eight, certain Stoics into twelve. Tertul-
lian said that this is to misunderstand the soul and that
these should be seen "not so much as parts of the soul, as
powers, or faculties, or operations thereof . . . even the
body would not admit of such as they have the soul un-
dergo." [8]

Yet, Tertullian strained so hard at maintaining the
wholeness of the person of man that Harnack accuses him
of a crude materialism. Nevertheless, it simply is not so
that just because these Apologists were participants in the
classical culture, therefore they were not concerned with
the integrity of the human person in Christ. They sought,
even to the point of overstatement, to maintain the whole-
ness of both the person of Christ and the selfhood of man
in a relationship of committed love. And, interestingly
enough, they maintained the latter by paying careful at-
tention to the philosophical and theological issues involved
in the former. In other words, their psychology sprang
from their theological understanding.

Gregory of Nyssa (circa 335-395) was another theolo-
gian who rooted his understanding of the total commit-
ment in love of man as a self in deep theological concern
for the Oneness of God. Henry P. Van Dusen says that

Gregory and his brother, Basil, and Gregory of Nazianzen, usually thought of as the Cappadocian fathers, "made the earliest attempt at a definitive formula of the Trinity." [9] Gregory moved from his understanding of the integrity of the image of God in man to reject the assumptions of certain philosophers as to the evil of the human body. He said, "For if the deity is the fullness of good, and this is his image, then the image finds its resemblance in the Archetype in being filled with good. . . . The main difference (between the image and the Archetype) is that the Archetype is uncreated and the image is created." [10]

Gregory and his fellow Cappadocians, Gregory of Nazianzen and Basil, presented a systematic formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity. This "solid structure of classical orthodox Christian theology" was substantially approved by the Second Council of Constantinople in 382. Belief in one God whose individual substance exists in three hypostases and incarnation in the Son were the conclusions stated. The Cappadocian fathers completed the doctrine of Trinity (as far as its doctrinal formulation was concerned) by formally stating the deity of the Holy Spirit. The One God is manifested as Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. They insisted upon the complete divinity and true manhood of Christ, as stated in Gregory of Nazianzen's maxim: "What was not assumed was not redeemed." [11]

The use of the term "person" was developed in Trinitarian discussion by the use of the Latin term *substantia* and the Greek equivalent *hypostasis*, which literally means "under standing." These terms were used in at least two senses. One meaning was a principle of differentiation of the persons of the Trinity without dividing the essence or

being of God. This is the sense in which orthodox theology has always used the term. But the other sense, as Cyril Richardson has said, meant "the fundamental essence behind the two modes of God's being . . . the underlying reality of the modes, the being of God itself." [12]

These were the issues to which the Cappadocian fathers addressed themselves. They tried to solve the problem of the Trinity without doing violence to the unity of the Godhead at the same time. They used a social analogy to explain that God is three—Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit —without exhausting or depleting in any way his oneness. They expressed this diverseness within unity, unity without uniformity. This they did by drawing an analogy from the relations of individuals to each other. Peter, James, and John, for example, can be three persons at the same time they belong to an underlying, all-encompassing humanity. Their having been born as individuals did not deplete but enriched the sum total of humanity with their individuality. With this they defended themselves against the charges of tri-theism in their worship of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. These were not three different functions of one God, such as creator, redeemer, and sanctifier. They were three persons, and all three such functions were inherent in and characteristic of each person. The pattern of development set forth in the social-psychological analogy of the Cappadocian fathers became the design for Eastern orthodoxy.

In the Western world, however, Augustine drew his analogy for the Trinity from the inmost consciousness of man.[13] Cochrane aptly insists that Augustine's theological treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity "provides a vindication of what may be called the primitive and original

values of selfhood, the sense of existence, of awareness, and of autonomous yet orderly activity which constitute the native endowment of man." [14] Augustine perceived in his own inner consciousness the design of the Trinity and called for a phenomenology of the human mind that accurately portrayed the divine image in us. He asserts a "triune character of selfhood," to use Cochrane's phrase, of existence, knowledge, and will. Augustine himself says: "I would that men would consider these three in themselves . . . for I am and know and will. I am knowing and willing; I know myself to be and to will; I will to be and to know. In these three, then, let him discern who can how inseparable a life there is, one life, one mind, and one essence; how inseparable a distinction and yet a distinction." [15] In *The City of God* [16] he says further that "we both exist, and know that we exist, and rejoice in this existence and this knowledge. In these three, when the mind knows and loves itself, there may be seen a trinity, mind, love, knowledge, not to be confounded by any intermixture, although each exists in itself and all mutually in all, or each in the other two, or the other two in each."

At first, one would assume that Augustine is laying a foundation for the doctrine of the Trinity in the consciousness of man. The contrary probably was true: he was developing an ordered understanding of the very existence of the self from or out of his knowledge of God in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit, that is, his experience of the Trinity. As Cochrane again says, for Augustine, "belief in God assumes the character of *intima scientia,* a kind of 'inner knowledge' akin to belief in the self; it is presumed or presupposed in the consciousness of his own existence and activity." [17] In the Trinity Augustine felt the legiti-

mate demand of God's love on his total being. At the same time he rejoiced in the conversation within himself of the constitutive parts of his selfhood in communion with each other. He found totality amid variety; harmony within diversity of selfhood.[18] The Bishop of Hippo challenged and disposed of several philosophical vagaries which hitherto had plagued Christianity. He tried to establish the wholeness of body and soul and to reconstitute a Hebrew view of the basic integrity of the total personality. He actually arrived at a psychophysical parallelism of body and mind. He saw the world of revelation and science together and thereby founded the very existence of the sciences in the character of God in Christ. And, finally, he brought into clear light of day the inner variety and "communityness" of the self under God. In a real sense, he was more consciously a "depth" psychologist in a greater way than any of his predecessors and than most of his successors. The self was seen in its true light: as not the opposition of body and soul, nor the opposition of the natural and supernatural, but as the creature of the Creator, alienated by sin but capable of reconciliation.

Karl Barth calls this doctrine of Augustine the *vestigium trinitatis.* He lists the thinkers in succeeding generations who have relied upon the "trinity within man" as evidence for the Trinity within the Godhead. Among these writers he says, "we find all sorts of modifications." Anselm of Canterbury, Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, Melanchthon, Lessing, and Schlatter are named. He refers to Schelling's triad of substance, object, and substance-object, and Hegel's "in-itself" of subjective spirit as thesis, "for-itself" of the objective spirit as antithesis, and "in-and-for-itself" of absolute spirit as synthesis. But in all these

pervasive expressions of the *vestigium trinitatis* Barth says that one finds only "fresh variants on the Augustinian proof of the Trinity itself." But, says Barth, these could not have appeared except on the background of already established Christian teaching. In other words, their psychological wisdom was the child of their already established religious belief in the Trinity. Barth stated it thus: "The case then was not that men wished to explain the Trinity by the world, but on the contrary that they wished to explain the world by the Trinity in order to speak of the Trinity in this world." [19]

Barth calls the *vestigium trinitatis* the "primeval Trojan horse" of theology, whereby the Trinity is derived from immediate evidences of the human consciousness. He says that whereas Augustine and others "had no intention to produce a second and different root of the doctrine of the Trinity parallel to revelation . . . this is precisely what they have done." [20] Barth's rejection of the whole approach to theology is so vigorous as to ignore the cultural conditions out of which Augustine and others spoke as compared to those to which Barth is addressing his polemic. Augustine spoke from the ancient and mediaeval side of the scientific revolution, and Barth speaks from the modern side of that upheaval in men's world view occasioned by the scientific revolution. The "Trojan horse" to Barth would have been a "straw man" to them. They spoke *as* theologians, not in some modern humanistic sense. Although Barth's logic in this connection is precise and correct, his historical imagination seems to be out of gear.

The doctrine of the Trinity as it was formally stated epitomizes the explicit truth which was always implicit in the Christian gospel, namely, that God has in Christ com-

municated his very being to us. Through the Holy Spirit he continues to do so. The act of God in Christ necessitated the doctrine of the Trinity. This doctrine deeply signifies both the Person of Christ and the selfhood of man. In turn, the depth of understanding the Christian pastor brings to people in need issues from his awestruck awareness of the historically complete way in which the One God has spoken to us in Three Persons. The pastor must, therefore, refuse to allow the meaningfulness of the Trinity to go unapproached in his many efforts at ministry, lest some small boy, even, feel his "last hope laid in the grave," as did Jung. He cannot relegate this doctrine of the ultimate nature and meaning of God to a secondary or even tertiary place in his efforts to understand and minister to people in their quest for identity and selfhood. In God's wholeness rests the promise of our own. In his internal diversity resides the reconciliation of our own conflicts.

Furthermore, the doctrine of the Trinity assays to express the inner diversity and depths of the Godhead. Claude Welch makes this observation: "God's inner distinguishing of himself as Father, Son and Spirit implies a communion or communityness of Father and Son in the Spirit." [21] In his redemptive encounter with God in Christ through the loving work of the Holy Spirit, man receives the truth of the inner variety of his own selfhood. He breaks out of the soliloquy of his own conversation with himself into the communion of the saints in the Body of Christ, the church. The worship of the One God, the Holy One of Israel, brings man into the wholeness and integrity of the self of which we spoke in the last chapter. The worship of God, the Father, God, the Son, and God, the Holy

Spirit brings man into awareness of the bipolar oneness and diversity of his own selfhood. In the focus of man's identity in the redemption offered in faith-encounter with Jesus Christ, man experiences both his own integration in singlehearted commitment to Christ and the "inner communityness" of his own nature in the variety of communion with his own thoughts and those of his brethren. As Andras Angyal says, biosphere of life is characterized in a bipolar pull between homonomous and heteronomous trends. Such a bipolar existence of the self in Christ calls for both an appropriation of the gospel through faith and a stewardship of the gospel through love in the hope of the resurrection.

The Trinity and the Appropriation of the Gospel

Father Florovsky has said that the doctrine of the Trinity is not a metaphysical abstraction, but the "intellectual contour of the faith" of believing Christians. The dramatic story of the emerging formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity is an odyssey of Christian experience. Henry P. Van Dusen writes, "The Trinity is not a dogma of theology at all, but a datum of experience. Historically the Trinity of experience long antedated the Trinity of dogma. . . . Worship . . . sought to voice not what theologians presumed to be true about the Being of God, but what ordinary Christians knew to be true in their experience of God." [22]

In this experience of the gospel, the redemption offered by God in Christ was appropriated through faith by ordinary Christians. They believed in God from the beginning. The gospel of Christ did not come to a people who did not believe in God. They already believed in the Holy One

of Israel. However, these persons did have another kind of unbelief. They did not believe that God could be seen and known directly. They did not believe that God could be revealed in the flesh. The Word was made flesh but this in itself was a stumbling block to the pious Jew and foolishness to the flesh-despising Greek. Nor did they believe that the Christ would be a suffering servant. Rather, they expected him as "the consolation of Israel" to be a ruling monarch to relieve them of their oppressors. To the contrary, however, the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ plunged them into the depths of participation in the inner being, the "communityness," of God. This participation in God's redemption in Christ and commissioning through the Holy Spirit broke the barriers of geography, created a people of all nations, and gave Christians identity and selfhood of their own. This selfhood was rooted in history, overarched with a clear-cut mission in the Triune God, and undergirded by the very Ground of Being itself.

The power of the gospel came to the early Christians first in their transforming encounter with Jesus as he came preaching repentance and the at-handness of the kingdom of God. They received him and followed him. Even though they had distorted perceptions of him as the Messiah, they stil believed him to be just that. In the development of their faith, they were spared asking such questions as these: Was he adopted as Son of God at his baptism? Was he *made* the Son of God by the Father as a reward for the crucifixion after his resurrection? These and many other questions were yet to come. Yet, the twoness of God was established in this encounter.

Upon the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, the

church was established as the Body of Christ and their experience of God was now manifest in the work of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit was the promise and the gift of the Father upon the request of the Son. Already, then, the Christians in all their courageous simplicity were involved in the rich diversity of the God whom hitherto they had seen only as Creator and Lawgiver. Now he was, as Barth puts it, a trinity of Revealer, Revealed, and Revealedness. But the focal self-expression of God in the Incarnation, Pittenger says, "does not stand alone in the story of God's action manward. In fact, the very notion of focus implies a wider operation which is both the background and the condition of it." [23] All this dynamic appropriation of the gospel made them feel assuredly that they had been entrusted with a treasure which they held in earthen vessels. They felt a heavy responsibility under the articulate commands of God to communicate this treasure of salvation and hope to all mankind.

The Trinity and the Stewardship of the Gospel

The very substance of the message which the Christians proclaimed carried with it a creative *outward* thrust. They encountered the rich inner diversity of the Eternal God in Christ. They felt the impact of his revelation of themselves as inwardly diverse beings in need of reconciliation and redemption. But it did not stop there. They were impelled by "that which was from the beginning," that which they had heard, which they had seen with their eyes, which they had looked upon and touched with their hands to communicate their experience to others. The purpose of this communication was to establish communion with, to extend the fellowship of Christ to all manner of men and

women. This was no esoteric cult, no closed circuit of communication. The Great Commission, stated in terms of the Trinity, was built into their identity as those to whom the kerygma had been entrusted to be communicated to all mankind. They considered themselves to be stewards of the mysteries of God. They responded to the call to proclaim this gospel "so that you might have fellowship with us, and our fellowship is with the Father and His Son Jesus Christ," they said.

But communication and fellowship demanded clear expression of the early Christians. Honest communication is always two-way. They, therefore, had to face the questions that those whom they sought to win would raise. They were faced with dealing with the distortions and misuses of the essential character of the gospel. In short, they were more and more called upon to define explicitly the unique understanding of God they had appropriated through faith in Jesus Christ.

Gregory of Nazianzen later described the plight of Christians of all ages when faced with the necessity for articulate exegesis of the doctrinal contours of their faith. He said that "it is difficult to conceive God but to define him in words is an impossibility. . . . In my opinion it is impossible to express him, and yet more impossible to conceive him . . . and this is not merely to the careless and ignorant, but even to those who are highly exalted and love God, and in like manner to every created nature." [24] Whereas one cannot do the impossible, when it is demanded one can *attempt* to accomplish it. This is exactly what the Christian church did in the formulation of the Trinitarian statement of their faith in God in Christ through the Holy Spirit.

John Oman aptly describes the process of knowledge when he says that it begins in an existential, immediate *awareness* of the wholeness of a truth or reality. Then, one is laid hold of or *apprehended* by that of which he had become aware in revelation. From this he moves on to differentiate the experience in its constituent parts and *to comprehend* the meaning of his experience for himself. Not until then is one ready to *explain* to another person what has happened to him. Even then he can draw and act only upon the outer contour of the ultimate concern which has gripped him.

The great eras of doctrinal construction and controversy, clarification, compromise, and commitment represent some such process as Oman has described. Christians were thrown into vital dialogue and violent controversy with the culture about them in their articulation of the meaningful content of their faith. The formal statements of Christian doctrine, of which the Trinity is the most comprehensive, arose out of this dialogue and controversy. The warp of Christian witness was woven together with the woof of available modes of communication in culture to produce the continuing fabric of theological truth. The point at which we are focally interested here is the way in which the proclamation of the Christ became interwoven with the psychological estimates or models of selfhood. *The psychological models—whether of an intrapersonal or an interpersonal nature—have historically been the analogies used by theologians to interpret the doctrine of the Trinity.* The psychology of personality—both prescientific and scientific—has, in a sense, been a crystallate of the common atmosphere of communication in a given age. The quest for an adequate analogy for explaining the Trin-

ity had both contributed to and drawn upon the psychological understanding of selfhood.

The Quest for an Adequate Analogy

As men sought to state doctrinally their experience of the full revelation of God in Christ, they groped crudely and with finesse for an adequate analogy with which to do so. This quest always led them to inquire into the inner recesses of the Being of God himself. In the Father-Son relationship they saw the interior richness of the love of God in a way they had never grasped it before. As Christians they were no longer willing to think of God as simply Creator, Provider, and Lawgiver. These were the externals of his Being as he projected himself into the world in terms of their primitive nature and appetites. But in Christ he had revealed his willingness to be known in all his hiddenness as the manifest God. He opened the inner recesses of his inexhaustible Being to mankind, giving them access to him in Christ through faith. He poured out his Spirit as a gift which they could not merit or achieve, but which they could only receive as the fullness of the Eternal self-imparting God and Father of Jesus Christ. They could exclaim as did the Apostle Paul: "O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and how inscrutable his ways! . . . For from him and through him and to him are all things" (Romans 11:33, 36).

Their quest for an adequate analogy thrust Christians back upon their knowledge of themselves and of their relationships to each other. These forms of knowledge and relationships provided intensely personal ways of describing the inner community of the Godhead, the diverse dia-

logue and inner riches of the Trinity. Their prayer for a deeper knowledge and better way of explaining their faith resulted in an increase and refinement of their knowledge of themselves *as selves* before God. In turn, the symbolic analogies they drew from their understanding of themselves and their relations to each other became the bases of formally stating their experience of God in Christ through the Holy Spirit. *The changing models of selfhood, however inadequate or symbolic, were and still are used to express the unchanging nature of the Godhead as revealed in Christ.* These conceptions of personality, derived from the interaction of the Christian witness with culture, are inevitably drawn on in considering the Trinity. But the historical error has been that they were not held with tentativeness as adequate for their day. All analogies must be used tentatively and with the awareness that they can be altered without altering the character of God in his threefoldness and oneness one whit. The analogy is not the reality of God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, but only speaks of him on wave lengths on which a given generation is communicating. This can be demonstrated and illustrated in many ways from different eras of Christological conversation.

Selfhood Analogies and the Trinity

Rudolf Bultmann has said that "we cannot speak of an act of God without speaking simultaneously of our own existence." [25] Speaking of God's act in Christ at the same time enables us to say more about our own selfhood than is true of any other act of God in history. Therefore, the great utterances of faith inherent in the doctrine of the Trinity reflect valuable guides to the understanding of

the problems of selfhood. Little wonder is it, therefore, that from the beginning of Trinitarian formulation theologians have built their concepts on the structural models of personality which they knew. We would confess that these are inadequate and run the risk of making God in the image of man. But on the other hand, the puristic theologians such as Barth find themselves using pounds of paper and ink in their efforts to avoid analogical thinking. Logical thinking is equally as misleading and fraught with opportunity for idolatry in that "the system" of the man's thought becomes a thing-in-itself. Thereby the system detracts attention from the Christ himself to the intricacies of the system. Nevertheless, be it logical or analogical thinking, the mode of communication must be assessed for its true pitfalls and then used to its utmost advantage. As James Muilenberg has said, "all language is sensuous and pictorial." This is true whether we are speaking of Christ or of ourselves.

Selfhood analogies for understanding the Trinity came more vividly to the fore when, under the leadership of Tertullian, the inadequate terms of Logos theology were relinquished in behalf of *"his designation of the personal element in the higher nature of Christ by the name Son."* [26] Prestige insists that Tertullian's use of *persona* is a much more concrete expression of individual selfhood than "as is commonly alleged, the holder of the legal title to a hereditament." [27] On the foundation of the separate individuality of the Son, Tertullian formulated his statement of the doctrine of the Trinity of "one substance, but three persons." Both he and Hippolytus, according to Prestige's descriptive analysis, used the term *persona* or *prosopon*

to mean individuality of selfhood, not just a mask worn in a docetic sense.[28]

The Selfhood Analogy: Adequate or Inadequate?

Real question is raised today as to the adequacy of ancient or modern analogies of selfhood to express the revelation of God in Christ as formally stated in the doctrine of the Trinity. Paul Tillich insists that the ontological structures of the self and the world are transcended in the divine life. "God cannot be called a self, because the concept 'self' implies separation from and contrast to everything which is not self." [29] He further states that the symbol of a "personal God" is confusing, because God is the ground of everything that is personal and cannot be equated with it. He is more than personal.

Tillich further points out that the classical patristic theology used the term "persona" for the three hypostases of the Trinity, but not for God himself. The importance of God as a "person" did not come into focus until the nineteenth century when Kantian separation of nature as ruled by physical law from personality ruled by moral law became the order of the day.[30] Karl Barth avers that the concept of the "personality" of God "is a product of the struggle against modern naturalism and pantheism." [31] He insists that the doctrine of the Trinity does not mean that there are three personalities in God. Rather, this would mean "the most pointed expression of tri-theism, against which we must guard." [32] Cyril Richardson contrasts the modern understandings of the person as "primarily a center of self-consciousness: with the classical patristic attitude in which the person meant a confrontation, "a facing toward" (*prosopon*) or a "sounding through" (*persona*).

In other words, the persons of the Trinity referred to the revelation of God in which God was encountered by "looking at him or by hearing him speak." This is quite different from the understanding of the self as a vital entity of self-awareness, separated from other selves and things.

On the basis of these classical understandings of the symbolism or analogies of selfhood, W. O. Johnson infers that "the modern psychological understanding of 'person' makes [tri-theism] inevitable" in interpreting the Trinity. Likewise he rejects this analogy for Christology in order to open the way for a more ecumenical attitude toward other living religions.[33] A lucid treatment of the problems associated with the social and psychological analogies of selfhood in both ancient and modern thought has been developed by Claude Welch. He points out that the ancient formulators conceived of personality in a very different sense from the self-conscious entities of modern understandings of personality. Herein he agrees with Richardson, Tillich, and Barth, all of whom seem to consider the patristic conception of personality either defective or inadequate. Yet, Welch presses the issue further in search of a "more precise statement of the content of the trinitarian conception of God." He takes modern Christologians such as Leonard Hodgson and Lionel Thornton to task for their insistence upon "organic unity of personal selves" in the instance of Hodgson and "the permeability and interpenetration of personalities" in the thought of Thornton. Welch feels that neither of these is true to the threefoldness of revelation in the New Testament nor avoids the hazard of tri-theism. Thereby they negate the unity of the Godhead, says Welch. Consequently, the use of the word "person" underlies the suspicion and neglect in which the

doctrine of the Trinity is held. Welch then asks for an adjustment of our language to fit the historical continuity of meaning which the Trinity historically has taught.

Welch chides the contemporary theologians such as Hodgson and Thornton in that they have not "appealed to contemporary analyses of sociology and social psychology" for more detailed theoretical models of personality. He suggests as helpful the social theory of selfhood of George Mead and the following definition of personality from Gardner Murphy: "Man is . . . a nodal region, an organized field within a larger field, a region of perpetual action, a reciprocity of outgoing and incoming energies." Then, he comes forth with his own answer to the problem of personhood within the Godhead. He prefers to think of the three "persons" as "modes of being," or, more exactly, "God's way of being God," ways of saying that "this is the structure of God's being" (the German word being *Seinsweisen*).

Yet Welch himself does not reflect enough awareness of how contributions of recent psychological theorists correspond with and corroborate his own point of view. For example, Andras Angyal "proposes to study life as a unitary whole and . . . to describe the organization and dynamics of the biosphere." By the "biosphere" he means the realm in which life takes place (*Lebenskreis*). The biosphere as a totality is not, nevertheless, structureless. In addition to the function-as-a-whole, the biosphere is differentiated along two lines, the autonomous determination, or organismic government, and heteronomous determination or environmental government.[34] Furthermore, the work of Kurt Lewin is also provocative in comparison with the point of view of Welch (which is not unlike that

of Barth). Lewin says, in summary of his observations on "the structure of mind," that "the distinction of relatively separate psychical systems leaves open various possibilities for the question of the unity and homogeneity of the self. . . . These psychical tensions and energies belong to systems which are in themselves dynamic unities. . . ." [35]

As one reads the works of theologians who reject the symbolism of "person" and "personality" as invalid for appreciation of the Trinity, one is puzzled as to what they mean when they use the word. They do not, with the exception of Welch, Thornton, and Hodgson, go to any great effort to identify the *inner content* of their idea of personality. They rather easily use the word "modern" with the reference to personality. They seem to infer that "moderns" are serenely agreed upon the meaning of personality. Much more detailed attention to the wide range of "modern" theories of personality could be given before blanket assertions of its inapplicability to the proper appreciation of the Trinity are made.

As has been suggested here, the *Gestalt* conceptions of Kurt Lewin, both in terms of the methodological approach to the science of the uniqueness of the individual and in terms of the detailed modeling of personality theory, are provocative if not conclusive in a modern use of the word "person" with reference to the Trinity. Also, Andras Angyal's conception of the biosphere is comprehensive and vital. The sphere of life itself breathes the same kind of atmosphere of thought we find in the New Testament. The additional concept of bionegativity with which Angyal designates the distorted and diseased structure of life provides further basis for considering the New Testament modes of thinking with reference to evil. Whereas these

conceptual modes of address are not final, neither are the easy conclusions of Christologians that the use of "person" with reference to the Trinity is passé. Yet any use of psychological analogy is time-bound and should be taken as suggestive and not conclusive, tentative and not final.

The Trinitarian Formula Itself:
Adequate or Inadequate?

The question as to the applicability of the term "person" to the Trinity raises deeper concerns about the adequacy of the whole doctrine. At the outset of this chapter, the story was told of the disappointment that C. G. Jung felt when his father told him that the catechetical class would "skip" the Trinity because he, the father, could not make anything of it. Claude Welch says that the Trinity as a doctrine has had a secondary place in theological thought, ranging all the way from outright rejection of the doctrine through the contemporary monarchian revision of the doctrine to the use of the doctrine as a position of defense against the critics of the faith. Cyril Richardson has most recently concluded that the "Trinity is an artificial construct," that we can and should use the terms Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, but that they do overlap in meaning and do not necessarily imply three distinct persons in the Trinity. What he actually proposes is a Binitarian view, all the while defending that in the life of Jesus God unveiled his mystery and wrought man's salvation.[36]

Two sets of problems emerge here when the question of the adequacy and relevance of the doctrine of the Trinity for our understanding of encounter with Christ and the selfhood of man is raised. First, Pittenger is right in challenging the position of Richardson on the grounds of the

"facts of experience and the experience of facts" of the encounter of men with God as the Trinity.[37] The process of the Christian experience of God—both historically and in the present—follows the interior relatedness of the Trinity. The distinctions within the Godhead are historically and ontologically real, not merely semantic differences. And, as Mollegen takes issue with Richardson, both Paul and John "seem quite clear and unambiguous . . . about the Spirit being the Son's other self." [38]

The second problem concerns the basic issue of symbolism and analogy itself. As Whitehead declares, "hard-hearted men want facts and not symbols." Yet "the successful adaptation of old symbols to changes of social structure is the final mark of wisdom in sociological statesmanship," says Whitehead. Therefore, symbolism itself "is no mere idle fancy or corrupt degeneration: it is inherent in the very texture of human life." [39] Consequently, theologians such as Paul Tillich and, to an even greater degree, Rudolf Bultmann, can declare with "uncompromising historical honesty" that "Jesus is the Christ," and that the subsequent working out of the Trinity as a doctrine is *symbolically* valid. Historical criticism, says Tillich, liberates the symbolism from "literalistic connotations" and thereby protects both faith and theology "against superstition and absurdity." [40]

However, such "demythologization" is attacked by Robert E. Cushman on epistemological grounds. He says it perpetuates the Kantian dualism between the knowable phenomenal world and the essentially unknowable noumenal world.[41] One is prone to agree with Cushman. The real question of the adequacy or completeness of the symbols of the Trinity, then, is whether or not God the Father,

Son, and the Holy Spirit is and are directly knowable by man through revelation and personal encounter. In over-emphasizing the symbolic character of Christian truth, men can be expressing their loss of hope for the knowledge of God who takes initiative toward us in Christ. Symbols become eons between men and an unknowable and un-revealed God. Then "the Christ" becomes a symbol of our own selfhood. Rather, we contend that God in Christ through the Holy Spirit has torn away the veil of both his-tory and symbol and encountered us directly in redemp-tion. Christ is not just a symbol of the self nor is the self a symbol of Christ. Rather, Christ is the creator and re-deemer of the self through the Holy Spirit.

C. G. Jung, however, takes another point of view and vigorously challenges the adequacy of the Trinity to ex-press the ultimate resolution of man's dilemma. He asks: "Is the self a symbol of Christ, or is Christ a symbol of the self?" He answers his question by affirming the latter al-ternative and saying that Christ, the "still living myth of our culture, *exemplifies the archetype of the self.*" [42] Yet Jung thinks also that the "Christ-symbol lacks wholeness in the modern sense" in that it lacks the "shadow" that properly belongs to it.

From this point of vantage, Jung enters his disclaimers by saying that he is not talking about the ultimate validity of Christian doctrine, nor even about the metaphysical reality of God. This concern is that of theologians, he says, and he is a layman, not competent to speak on such mat-ters. Yet, having said this, he continues to challenge the completeness of the traditional view of the Trinity. He considers it to be "a one-sided way of thinking." It leaves out, he thinks, the hard truth that God is not wholly good.

Evil is a part of his nature, too, says Jung. "To believe that God is the Summum Bonum is impossible for the reflecting consciousness." [43] On the force of this conviction he says that "whereas the Christian symbolism is a Trinity, the formula presented by the unconscious is a quaternity." He says that the Trinity of orthodox Christians is incomplete and inadequate because the dogma, as important as it is, does not include the principle of evil.[44]

Jung proceeds to make a case for including Satan alongside the Trinity in order that the total archetype of the self might be completed in a quaternity. His book, *Answer to Job*, moves on the premise that the Christ in deed and in fact is the answer to Job's question as to whether or not God *is* love in addition to being all-powerful. He leaves the distinct impression that the Incarnation effected *changes* in the Godhead's character, transforming God into a Christlike God. The continuing changes in the Godhead during the Christian era, according to Jung, move along the line of including the principle of evil in the person of the devil and the principle of the feminine in the person of the Virgin Mary in the being of God. Thus Jung sees the archetype of the self being completed in the dogmatic formulations concerning the Godhead.

The mutability of the human self becomes the mutability of God when one considers the Christ a symbol of the self which needs completing to correspond adequately with the archetype of the self. The psychotherapist constantly confronts the disassociation of the darker impulses of the self which go on unassimilated into the total *Gestalt* of the patient's life. He would be glad indeed if Christian theologians and pastors made room, not only in their practical judgments but also in the convincing symbols of their

preaching, for a more realistic inclusion of the conflictual and ambiguous character of the best of Christian living. He also observes the rejection of tenderness in men and the lack of realism and wisdom in women's sentiments. He could wish that the *kerygma* preached by Christians would include more of the gentleness of Mary and more of the wisdom of the serpents (a symbol for Satan) in their proclamation.

But the Christian theologian would reply that the sentimentalizing of the understanding of God has gone on apace with the optimism of psychological interpretations of human selfhood. The doctrines of hell and the devil have to a great extent lost their force. This part of the Christian symbolism may be less alive than formerly. The doctrine of original sin has only since World War II returned to make the sense that it formerly did. At the same time, contemporary drama has rejuvenated the person of Satan in such plays as "Don Juan in Hell," "No Exit," and "J.B." Then, too, the psychotherapeutic theories of neurosis have been invested with all the fear of punishment and hell from which men would flee. Little wonder is it, then, that in the *rapprochement* between psychotherapy and the Christian faith Christian ministers are beginning once again to be challenged to take evil, Satan, and hell more seriously, if not in crude anthropomorphisms, in the way Satan and hell represent the objective realities within the self of man.

The Christian pastor's concern for the wholeness of man necessitates his asking questions about the wholeness of the gospel he preaches. Does he pay adequate attention to the ontology of evil, or "wickedness in the high places"? He can be challenged by the ingenious questions Jung and

others raise about the completeness of the doctrine of the Trinity to address itself to the total depths of man's being. We have tended to forget or to exclude, in our efforts to be "nice" Christians and to demand of God that he be a "nice" God, that the only way to understand the meaning of the existence of Satan is in relation to the Trinity. "Any theological treatment of the devil that is not related to God's trinitarian consciousness is a falsification of the actual position." [45] We cannot explore the depths of our own selfhood nor inquire into the inner diversity of the Godhead without encountering, not only the image of the Trinity, but also the Adversary whom the Revelator called Satan. Any departure of his is but for a season, even though we are led in our explorations of the inner world by the Holy Spirit.

The Trinity and the Activation of Selfhood

The doctrine of the Trinity concentrates the results of centuries of encounter with Christ. It epitomizes the efforts of Christians at articulation of their knowledge of God in Jesus Christ. The doctrine itself symbolizes the struggle of self-realization which has gone on in individual Christians and within the corporate fellowship of the church for centuries. Amazingly enough, the doctrine represents a common touchstone of faith of Christians of exceptionally diverse groups within Christendom. Whereas Christians may disagree on such matters as forms of baptism, interpretations of the Lord's Supper, or degrees of authority vested in the priesthood, nevertheless, they find a ground of being together when they come to discuss the Trinity as expressing their corporate understanding of God. Their deepest divisions have been, at the same time,

at those points when they disagreed most violently about this particular doctrine. One asks, "If this is true, why, then, is it true?"

The Trinity, as a doctrinal articulation of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, has such a deep-running universality of relevance among Christians because the experience of God in his Triune revelation experientially activates the very selfhood of man. We behold the glory and truth of God in Jesus Christ. God, who said, "Let light shine out of darkness," is the same God who shines in our hearts "to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (II Corinthians 4:6). This Shekinah of revelation throws into bold contrast *the history from which we have been called*. We see ourselves as having been "called out of darkness," as previously having been given to "disgraceful, underhanded ways," depending upon our own cleverness and cunning, and "living in chambering wantonness." We see ourselves as having no corporate identity, as being "no-people" whose minds were "blinded by the gods of this world." We feel ourselves to have been in bondage to the elemental spirits of the universe which by their nature were "no-gods." This is our history of alienation, of the absence of identity, the bondage to idols and the engulfment of darkness out of which we have been called.

At the same time that we are acutely aware of the history *out of which* we have been called, we are for this very reason the more sensitive to the destiny *into which* we have been called, the reality of which we are now partakers. The identity that was the gift of God in creation now in Christ is a treasure of selfhood. We have been called "into his marvelous light." We have obtained mercy.

Now we can enjoy the peace of God. We are now the people of God, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people. We have been bought with a price. Therefore we glorify God in our total being. We have become children of God, and we feel the destiny of becoming like him at the same time we pray to see him as he is. This is the "lively hope" unto which we have been begotten by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. This is our destiny. To it we contribute our unique individuality and from it share a common destiny of selfhood. We can cope with the stresses and tribulations of life because the love of God had been "shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit." The relationship to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit is no abstraction to us; this relationship is life itself. This relationship *is* our destiny, and we are committed as total beings to his commands. Out of this relationship and commitment comes our vocation, our "commissioning."

We are commissioned to transcend the external supports of selfhood upon which we previously depended. What are these external supports? In the first place, they are attempts to focus our identity around our particular *race*. We can no longer claim a unique selfhood because our skin is white; nor because it is black. This is an external support of selfhood which collapses in time because it is born in time. Another external support of selfhood is *nationality*. The gospels of holy soil, North, East, South or West are also a vain hope. The temples of geography shall be destroyed and left without one stone standing on another. The songs of Zion cannot be sung in a strange land as long as they are the *songs of Zion*. They are broken reeds upon which a man can not safely lean. Another ex-

ternal support is our *family*—either that of our parents or that of our marriage. This, too, is to be enjoyed as a gift of God with thanksgiving but not as a substitute for personal participation in Christ. Furthermore, the very creedalization of the Trinity itself can become an external support of selfhood. The parties that have arisen around this or that interpretation of the doctrine of God also become broken reeds upon which men have sought to support their "brief authority" for a little time. The transformation of the Trinity of experience into a doctrinal party cry is a poor substitute indeed for the encounter which the doctrine seeks to catalyze in one generation after generation. Rather, the internal birth and sustenance of selfhood and identity come from the obedience to the command of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

That command is always given in the atmosphere of promise and in the presence of living communion. That command is both the invocation and the benediction of selfhood which transcends race, nationality, and creed. Out of this comes the vocation of every Christian: "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age" (Matthew 28:19-20). The mystery of faith in the Triune God, in all its multidimensionality reveals to us "who we are and what we have become; where we were or where we have been made to fall; whither we are hastening, whence we are being redeemed; what birth is and what rebirth is." [46] Yet it does not appear what we shall be. Camus expresses the unrevealed mystery of selfhood thus: "If I try to seize this self of which I feel sure, if I try to

summarize it, it is nothing but water slipping through my fingers. I can sketch one by one all the aspects it is able to assume, all those likewise that have been attributed to it, this upbringing, this origin, this ardor or these silences, this nobility or this vileness. But aspects cannot be added up. This very heart which is mine will remain forever indefinable to me." [47] How much more of a mystery is the Trinity!

NOTES FOR CHAPTER SEVEN

1. W. Norman Pittenger, *The Word Incarnate* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), p. 216.
2. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 1375.
3. C. G. Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1959), p. 15.
4. *God in Patristic Thought* (See Note 6), p. xviii.
5. Quoted by Prestige (see Note 6), p. 98.
6. G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (London; S.P.C.K., 1936), p. 99. By permission.
7. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, trs. (Buffalo, N. Y.: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885), Vol. III, p. 184.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 193.
9. Henry P. Van Dusen, "The Trinity in Experience and Theology," *Theology Today*, Vol. XV, Oct., 1958, No. 3, pp. 377-386.
10. Gregory of Nyssa, "On the Making of Man," *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, Chap. xvi, Vol. 5, p. 405. This distinction was later made by Augustine in combating the idea that the body is intrinsically evil. Neither body nor spirit is elevated to a divine position, because both are created, creaturely, and under the sovereign rulership of God who holds them in dynamic relationship with each other. Actually he held to a psychophysical parallelism of mind and body, not unlike that of E. B. Titchenor's.
11. *Christology of the Later Fathers* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954), pp. 26-28.

12. Cyril C. Richardson, *The Doctrine of the Trinity* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1958), pp. 63-64.
13. Henry P. Van Dusen, *op. cit.*, p. 380.
14. Charles N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (Oxford, Eng.: Oxford University Press, 1944), p. 400.
15. Augustine, Confessions, xiii, xi, 12.
16. *Ibid.*, xi, 26.
17. Cochrane, *op. cit.*, p. 407.
18. For a full development of the contribution of Augustine to the understanding of selfhood, consult the unpublished doctoral dissertation of John H. MacClanahan, "The Psychology of the Self in the Writings of Augustine," Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., 1957.
19. Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons), Vol. I, Part 1, pp. 383-399.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 396.
21. Claude Welch, *In This Name* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), p. 240.
22. Henry P. Van Dusen, "The Trinity in Experience and in Theology," *Theology Today*, Vol. XV, No. 3, p. 377.
23. Pittenger, *op. cit.*, p. 215.
24. Gregory of Nazianzen, *Oratio* xxviii, iv, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, Vol. VII, p. 289.
25. Rudolf Bultmann, *Kerygma and Myth* (London: S.P.C.K., 1953), p. 199.
26. I. A. Dorner, *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898), Vol. II, p. 79.
27. Prestige, *op. cit.*, p. 159.
28. See the analysis of the meaning of these terms in the book by this author, *Religious Dimensions of Personality* (New York: Association Press, 1957), pp. 31-51.
29. *Systematic Theology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), Vol. I, p. 244.
30. *Ibid.*
31. Karl Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 403.
32. *Ibid.*
33. W. O. Johnson, "The Coming Copernican Christology," *The Hibbert Journal*, Vol. LIX, No. 1, p. 15.
34. Andras Angyal, *Foundations for a Science of Personality* (New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1941), pp. 100-101.

35. Kurt Lewin, *A Dynamic Theory of Personality*, D. K. Adams and Karl E. Zener, trs. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1935), p. 62.
36. Cyril Richardson, *The Doctrine of the Trinity, op. cit.*, pp. 148-150.
37. See *The Word Incarnate, op. cit.*, pp. 233-234.
38. A. T. Mollegen, Review of Cyril Richardson's *The Doctrine of the Trinity, Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, May, 1958, p. 59.
39. Alfred North Whitehead, "Uses of Symbolism," *Symbolism in Religion and Literature*, Rollo May, ed. (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1960), pp. 233-234.
40. *Systematic Theology, op. cit.*, pp. 108, 112-113.
41. Robert E. Cushman, "Is the Incarnation a Symbol?" *Theology Today*, Vol. 15, p. 180.
42. C. G. Jung, *Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self*, Vol. 9, Part II, *AION: Collected Works* (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1959), pp. 36-37, 68.
43. C. G. Jung, *Answer to Job* (New York: Pastoral Psychology Press, 1955), p. 93.
44. C. G. Jung, *Psychology: West and East*, Vol. II, *Collected Works*, R. F. C. Hull, tr. (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1958), p. 59.
45. *Ibid.*
46. R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), p. 7.
47. Alfred Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1955), p. 14. By permission.

The Design of the Self in Christ

> "... I am in travail with you over again until you take the shape of Jesus Christ" (Galatians 4:19, *The New English Bible*).
>
> God does not take the place of the creatures He rules; on the contrary He assists them so as to make it possible for them to perform their own operations.[1]

This concluding chapter should bring together the design of the self in Christ as it has been portrayed through the preceding pages. As Camus has stated, the mystery cannot be removed from selfhood. A design of selfhood is "legitimate only in precisely so far as it is approximate."[2]

We have made a working distinction between identity and selfhood. Identity refers to the larger design of man's existence in creation. Identity connotes his commonalty with all mankind. As Sullivan was fond of saying, man is more distinctly human than otherwise. This is his identity. Yet it is diffuse, unclarified, unfocused. In it he is Mr. Anybody or Mr. Everybody. Therefore, we introduced the working hypothesis that selfhood refers to the specific focusing and clarification of man's identity. Here Mr. Anybody and Mr. Everybody become Mr. Somebody, a cer-

tain man, a defined self with a central focus and specific awareness of "I-ness." The central question, therefore, to which this book has been addressed is this: "How does the identity of man become so focused and clarified?" We have been concerned with this more general question. This concern has served as a basis for applying the "whole counsel of God" which we have known in Jesus Christ to the identity of man. We have assumed that encounter with Jesus Christ is the decisive factor in the specific quality of selfhood we understand as Christian selfhood.

This in turn has introduced another pair of hypotheses into our design of Christian selfhood: namely, the inner content of the Christian message itself as being decisive, and the imperative character of decision itself as an act of faith in Christ. We were faced with the necessity of distinguishing between different qualities of selfhood and frankly insisting that one does not have to be a Christian in order to be a self. This posed the necessity of making clear what we mean by selfhood in general as opposed to selfhood in particular as men know themselves to be selves in Christ. A recapitulative summary of the specifications of any kind of selfhood at this point will serve as a basis for a further discussion of what we have said about the design of Christian selfhood.

Empirical Generalizations About the Design of Selfhood

Certain common features characterize *any* kind of selfhood as we know it, particularly in a Western culture. These features can be summarized somewhat as follows. First, every person that comes into the world has a cultural and personal history. None of us is a psychological

Melchizedek, sprung into existence full-blown without mother or father. Each person by empirical circumstances is born into a different station in life from any other person, although the grosser commonalties of geography, family name, or race may be roughly the same. For that matter no two children are born into the same family, *exactly*. The first child is the *only* child until the second one is born. The second child is born to parents who have experience with a first child by which to judge their patterns of rearing the second one. They are somewhat different persons now. This particularity in personal and cultural history sets a person on the road to a unique history and individuality of his own. But the *interpretation*, the *meaning*, and the *ordering* which that particular person decides to give to these events of his history focus his identity in a way that is especially his own.

In the second place, this self-conscious assignment of meaning to one's own existence, quite apart from any distinctly Christian definition either he or his culture may give to it, brings a certain focus and direction to his identity which shapes his selfhood. The focus itself implies a certain direction and ongoingness which raises the existential question of vocation and calling in the person's life. He makes a decision to do or not to do something with his life. He develops a set of affirmations or negations or, better, a set of affirmations and negations which become the Magna Charta of his being and becoming. Even the symptoms of badly regressed mentally ill patients have much of this kind of self-definition in them. We are not particularly talking about well persons as opposed to sick ones. Sickness itself can and does become the organizing center of a distinct way of life. In fact, some acutely men-

tally ill persons seem to have been consigned by those about them to sickness as the only slit of the light of selfhood their family and community will permit them. The Gadarene demoniac served his community in a macabre-like way. The townsmen saw in him all the things that they refused to see in themselves.

But more positively, every person has his life on his hands and makes certain decisions as to what he is going to do with it. These decisions begin to fall into a pattern that furnishes the focus and contour of his selfhood. This set of decisions represent what he has valued and devalued, accepted and rejected, affirmed and denied. As such these values furnish structure, ontologically rooted, to the selfhood of a person. They become the permanent yet permeable stuff of which he is made. They are permanent in that he has continuity with "all that he has ever done" and is a part of all he has met. They are permeable in that the ongoing processes of life permeate the self as it is until it becomes something different and new every day. The energetic field of the self is not a static existence. Each time new conflict arises upon the permeation of new experience, change and growth or change and retreat take place. This implies that every self faces the further task of determining what is durable and what is not, what among the values of life can be trusted faithfully and what cannot. For example, Erich Fromm, in defining his own selfhood as a religious person, asks whether or not organized religion "can be trusted." [3] The further definition of any person's identity comes as he decisively focuses upon the destiny-kinships of his life. By this we have meant the explicit definitions of his covenant-making ability, his powers of commitment and faithful trust.

Furthermore, as has already been intimated, these value structures of the self are not static. They develop and move forward. They reach back and catch up on undealt-with conflicts and move forward again after dropping back awhile. Under severe threat and total resistance from without, they can beat a hasty retreat. As Lewin, with his concept of "going out of the field," said, an individual may permanently break relationship to his covenanted community and durable commitments. But in all instances, selfhood is brought into a clear-cut outline as a figure against the ground of identity.

The next problem we confront in the focusing of selfhood is the adequacy of center of ultimate concern around which the self is focused. The loyalty-center of the self provides a magnetic center for the self. At the same time it furnishes a principle of organization of the inner variety of systems of the identity of man. Man is not a simple integer, but a complex system of competing structures. A larger frame of orientation and center of devotion must provide the inner patterning of the role-demands of man. Otherwise, man is not a defined self at all but a cacophony of warring voices. His very health and life can be jeopardized without an adequate center of life. Whether we define this center of all being as God or not, some center begins to take place. Whatever the orientation is, whether it is the marketing orientation of which Fromm speaks, negatively, or the humanistic orientation which he extols, or some other self-chosen center of existence, for that individual it becomes an ultimate concern. As such it has power—power to confer integration and hope or disintegration and disillusionment upon the self. From this, no

self is exempt, nor does his choice necessarily have to be too conscious.

However, the integration which such a center of loyalty and commitment confers upon the self is not a single-dimensioned integration. The self is not only one, but it is diverse and multidifferentiated. Lewin reminds us that it is open to question as to whether the self is a "functional part region within [a] psychic totality."[4] The internal diversity of the self, particularly the productive and creative self, impresses itself upon empirical observation both in the educational and the therapeutic contexts of life. One of the crucial ethical problems of the self is that of maintaining harmony among the various roles of life, for instance, all of them being quite legitimate roles. Whether one applies specific religious content to these roles or not, the task of bringing them into co-operative rather than competitive, contributive rather than exploitative, relation to each other is a major task of selfhood. The ordering of life itself is a demand that is no respecter of persons, religious or not. How to maintain both unison and harmony is the symphonic task of the self which does not capitulate to sheer monotony and boredom.

The Design of Christian Selfhood

These more general, empirical observations concerning selfhood serve as a basis for clarifying in summary the design of Christian selfhood as we have discussed it in detail in this book. We have, in the first place, seen that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ took seriously the history of mankind as a race and of each man individually in the Incarnation. Man is confronted in his history of sin in such a way that he is prompted to take seriously

his own heritage and autobiography to the point of re-
pentance and faith in the forgiveness Christ offers. This
radical encounter brings a new meaning and interpretation
of faith to man's past. The Incarnation reconciles the
alienated and estranged man and brings him an acceptance
that enables and empowers him to accept himself. The
encounter of the Incarnate Christ brings selfhood out of
man's conflictual identity, a new creature out of an old
existence. This focus of selfhood in Christ determines the
radical difference between Christian selfhood and any
other kind. There is both continuity and discontinuity
with the old self. The self is never *completely* different,
but the radical change has been accomplished. The self is
never *completely* the same again, either. Jesus Christ made
the difference.

The Christian self, brought into reconciliation with it-
self and with God through encounter with Christ, is then
confronted with the decision as to what one is going to do
with the life that has been redeemed. The decision as to
the vocational heart of selfhood is a reciprocal one of
choice on the part of man and calling on the part of Christ.
The self both lays hold of and is laid hold of by the pur-
pose of God in Christ. The things that are behind in one's
history may shape his existence now, but the determina-
tive power is the calling of God. This calling sanctifies all
life, and the complex variations of the emerging adult's
many roles are brought under the synthesizing and integ-
rity-producing power of the Anointed One who himself
lived in that purity of heart which, as Sören Kierkegaard
expresses it, means "to will one thing." The calling of
Christ is the redemption of all life which disavows the arti-
ficial distinctions between sacred and secular, living and

dead, material and spiritual. All life becomes hallowed in this stance of reverence in calling. This calling provides the perspective from which all creation is surveyed in Christ, the Anointed One.

The self in Christ participates in forgiveness and calling, then, but now the threat of separation and disillusionment must be dealt with effectively. The dependability, trustworthiness, and indefectibility of this relationship in Christ was dealt with triumphantly in the Resurrection. Here the decisive act of God in Christ brings the radical transformation that the hope which is in Christ will not disappoint men. The relationship between the self and Christ cannot be separated by either life or death. This assurance comes from a different order of knowledge wrought by faith, a relational knowledge that comes from distinguishing between dependable and undependable relationships. Dependence here is not a symbiotic attachment of a child to a parent but a faithful discovery that Christ is a trustworthy witness to the Power of God. We can depend on what he says and does as being truthful and loving, durable and everlasting. The relationship which has begun in faith and trust here transcends both grief and disappointment.

Furthermore, this covenantal relationship is not just a transaction: it is a participant pilgrimage of growth and maturity in Christ. The discussion we have developed correlated the self in process with the continuing ministry of the Holy Spirit. Whereas the work of the Holy Spirit was looked upon not merely as the sanctification of the total personality, we nevertheless related the work of the Holy Spirit to the continuing encounter of man with both intrapsychic and interpersonal tension and conflict. Con-

flict was perceived as the growing edge of the self, and the Holy Spirit was understood as the consistent Counselor of the self amid temptation and conflict.

The structural integrity and flexible versatility of the self in Christ were brought into bipolar relation to each other in the discussion of the psychological significance, on the one hand, of Christian monotheism and, on the other hand, of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. The reciprocal relationship between the doctrinal development of the Christian doctrine of God was correlated with the prescientific modes of interpretation of the self. Some attempt was made to evaluate the adequacy or inadequacy of prescientific analogies of the Trinity. The suggestion was made that these were chosen as modes of communication of the Christian faith in their day. Any choice of psychological modes of interpreting the Person of Christ in the Godhead must be chosen today with a sharp sense of tentativeness, not as a finality. The problems of Christology in our day may spring from our having left the translation of ancient psychological modes of interpretation to the common vernacular of our day. The Trinity bespeaks the experience of the early Church and the internal richness and diversity of God's encounter with man in Christ. In the Trinity we find an inexhaustible mystery and power of being for selfhood in Christ.

Finally, the Christian self itself is characterized by mystery and, as we have said, no design of it is valid unless it is recognized as proximate. Yet the fact that we prophesy in part does not reduce the strength of our conviction of the origin, calling, and destiny of the self in Christ.

Psychological Factors in Christian Experience

For the workaday efforts of the pastor in action and the psychologist and psychiatrist who may genuinely be concerned as to the residual stresses in human selfhood to which Christian experience addresses itself, some concluding word needs to be said about the psychological factors in Christian experience. The preceding pages have reiterated these many times, but in summary they are as follows.

The Christian experience of the Incarnation addresses itself to the redemption of the genuinely human existence of the self. Christ demonstrates human existence in its basic genuineness as set forth in creation. The redemption of Christ has the creation of man as the sculptural model of his intention. The redemption in Christ aims to remove all subterfuge, artificiality, fictitiousness, and counterfeit attempts at selfhood in order that through forgiveness and reconciliation the genuinely human existence to which we have been called might be brought into focus. The psychologist and the psychiatrist usually think of this as acceptance. In the Christian perspective, acceptance comes through justification by faith, not through superficial neutrality nor any other self-justifying procedure.

The second psychological factor in Christian experience is the discovery and continual recovery of meaningfulness in existence. The self is validated in the presence of suffering by its longest-range intentions, as Allport called them. These long-range intentions supply renewed meaning to the self. Mead and Wolff underscore "what hope does for man." Frankl, in his logotherapy, searches for the meaning in suffering. We have rejected legalism for the

very reason that it results in a lack of a sense of being. We have turned to the meaningful existence in Christ as a gift of grace for the very reason that life is filled by him with an abundant sense of being.

A third psychological factor in Christian experience has been effectively emphasized throughout these pages. That is the factor of *decision*. The existential psychologists and psychotherapists are productively engaged in the exploration of the psychology of decision. They are concerned about "the-person-who-is-responsible-for-his-existence-choosing," as Rollo May says.[5] This is an area of psychology which has been taken for granted by Christian theologians and until recently neglected by psychologists. But here is a domain of fruitful research which will provide increasingly wider grounds of interdisciplinary discussion between the behavioral scientists and the Christian theologian. Of what does decision itself consist? Under what conditions does it take place optimumly and under what conditions is decision impeded? These and many other questions concerning decision are open ones for research.

The final psychological factor to which the Christian faith addresses itself is the paradox of integrity of the self in the presence of the affirmation of the variety of energy-constellations within the self. For example, the culture almost requires that a man becomes a specialist in one particular area in order to earn a living, to define his status, to experience a modicum of the success by which the culture judges him as a person. On the other hand, however, what happens to the variety of budding lesser interests and avocations of life? Particularly, is this true of his religious interests if he is in a scientific specialty which

precludes this interest in the name of his professional "objectivity"? Or, if one is a minister, what happens to his interest in other types of work if he is to give all his time to one ecclesiastical endeavor? On the other hand, if he becomes too absorbed in too many things, what will happen to his official ministerial work? Another example of this stress between unity and diversity versus harmony of motivation is the contemporary marriage. Ernest Groves very early pointed out that singlehearted devotion to one mate can be enriched by responsible and mature relationships to other members of the opposite sex. Yet, the threat of polygamous and polygynous involvements is always at hand.

The Christian faith states these problems in cosmic, theological, and yet personal terms. The tension between the One and the Three is a recognition of the paradox of integrity and variety both in the Being of God and the selfhood of man. The re-exploration of the Christian doctrine of vocation is in itself a natural outgrowth of such a study as this. The hallowing of all existence grows out of hallowing the name of the Father in heaven. The self in Christ is designed for the affirmation and confrontation of every conflict and barrier. Every man who struggles to define his identity, and every self who has built his life around anyone or anything less than Christ as the Protagonist of life on our behalf, not only confronts, but is sought by Christ.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER EIGHT

1. Etienne Gilson, *The Christian Philosophy of St. Augustine* (New York: Random House, Inc., 1960), p. 238.
2. Alfred Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1955), p. 15.
3. Erich Fromm, *Psychoanalysis and Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), p. 34.
4. Kurt Lewin, *A Dynamic Theory of Personality*, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1935), p. 56.
5. *Existence*, Rollo May, ed. (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958). p. 41.